



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 79th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 7, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, April 16, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of mercy and of justice, in these glad days for which our anxious souls have waited in an agony of hope deferred, we are humbly grateful that Thou art using our imperfect hands to loose the bonds of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, to let the oppressed go free, to break every yoke of oppression. We thank Thee that in this hour the embattled souls of those whose bodies sleep where white crosses keep their vigil are marching under banners of triumph their valor hath brought to pass.

For the clean air of freedom that at last is blowing through the putrid prisons of satanic cruelty, we bless Thy holy name; who by human swords bathed in heaven hast thundered Thy righteous sentence, "Let my people go."

We thank Thee that Thou hast allowed our grateful eyes to see truth, crushed to earth by cruel might, rising in splendor again; while error and falsehood, wounded and writhing in deserved pain, dies among its worshippers. Amid the wrecks of ancient systems in this confused day, make us worthy in our motives and desires to help lead toward the promised land of a loftier life for our children and a cleaner and fairer world for all the peoples of the earth. In the Redeemer's name, we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, May 3, 1945, was dispensed with, and the journal was approved.

POST-WAR RECONVERSION — CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN HON. O. MAX GARDNER AND THE LATE PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Record at this point a copy of a letter addressed to the late President Roosevelt, under date of April 5, by the Honorable O. Max Gardner, chairman of the Advisory Board, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, which letter was written on behalf of the Board; also a copy of the late President Roosevelt's reply to Governor

Gardner's letter, and a copy of a letter from the Honorable Jonathan Daniels, secretary to the President, with reference to the late President's letter to Governor Gardner. I might say that, to my mind, this correspondence is of historic significance, particularly at this time when we know we have before us the very great and challenging problem of reconversion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama?

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION
AND RECONVERSION,
Washington, D. C., April 5, 1945.
The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As chairman of the Advisory Board of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion I have been directed by resolution to transmit to you the communication which follows here.

The Advisory Board of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, created by Congress, appointed by you, and confirmed by the Senate, assembled this day at the White House, respectfully submits to you the following message:

We have expressed publicly our profound regret at the resignation of Justice Byrnes from the directorship of this office, and we here express our highest confidence in Judge Vinson, whom you have nominated as his successor. It is fortunate that in great crises our Nation produces public servants such as these.

Events of recent days have given us a sense of special concern about our responsibilities. The membership of the Advisory Board appointed to represent the public interest includes members experienced in the affairs of business, management, labor, and agriculture. It is the immediate responsibility of the Board, in these critical moments, to bring to the director by advice and recommendations its best thoughts and assistance, reflecting the views of the different economic groups and the opinions and feelings of the people throughout the country.

Reports from the battlefields of Europe make it clear that the days of the Nazi tyranny are numbered. There will remain the grim necessity of intensive prosecution of the Japanese war. With that nothing must interfere.

Yet military victories will be hollow, empty of meaning, if we fail in rebuilding a peacetime economy far stronger and more productive than we have had before. In a shattered world, our Nation's success or failure in post-war readjustment may well determine whether the world can achieve a stable peace and security. If we—with vast resources and undamaged industrial facilities—can provide full employment in the United States for all those willing and able to work, we can fulfill our economic commit-

ments in supplies and machinery to other nations for their reconstruction. We will then be able to carry out the responsibilities that lie in the proposals developed in international conferences at Hot Springs, Dumbarton Oaks, and Bretton Woods.

By magnificent cooperation of industry, labor, and farmers on the home front we have achieved unprecedentedly high levels of wartime production, income, and employment. National solvency itself demands the maintenance of those high levels of production, income, and employment in the reconversion period and into the peacetime economy. The Nation has demonstrated that we can do this for war. We can and must do it for peace. In achieving it, the aspirations of the people of this Nation and of the world will find their fulfillment.

These observations lead us to the following firm convictions:

1. That full employment can and will be attained here in the United States.

2. That it can be achieved under our system of competitive free enterprise. In the conversion period, bold ventures by all our citizens are necessary and the role of government must be positive. This does not call for any compromise with traditional American institutions and relations of government, labor, business, and agriculture.

3. That the full use of our resources of materials and manpower can produce a national income which, properly distributed, will bring about sound and stable business and industrial activity, higher real wages, better health, housing, and education for all.

4. That the veterans returning when war is finally at an end will then find a respected and secure place in the economic life of the Nation.

5. That this Nation can and will in that way help the needy in devastated lands abroad to alleviate their misery and enable them again to provide for themselves.

These convictions constitute our declaration of faith in the future of the Nation. It is our firm purpose to do our best toward translating that faith into accomplishment as the foundation stone of world peace. We believe and know that it can be done. To this end we pledge our best efforts toward the preparation of a broad program of public and private action at the earliest possible time.

It is therefore our sincere and earnest desire to serve Director Vinson and our country in every possible way within the powers of our official capacity and as representatives of the public.

With high regards, believe me,

Sincerely yours,
O. MAX GARDNER,
Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 6, 1945.

HON. O. MAX GARDNER,
Chairman of the Advisory Board
of the Office of War Mobilization
and Reconversion,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MAX: I am deeply grateful to the Advisory Board of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion for its expression of

faith, both in our war effort and in the necessity that our certain victory mean at home a peacetime economy far more abundant and productive than we have ever had before. You know how completely I agree. I want you to know also how much I appreciate the agreement of such Americans as compose your board.

We have been fortunate in finding in Justice Byrnes and Judge Vinson public servants equal to our great tasks. They emphasize, as do the members of your board, that there has been no shrinkage in the stature and the spirit of the American. Indeed, I am sure that Americans who have done so much in the winning of the war have no doubt that we can give victory the rich meaning of full employment in the United States and of assistance to other nations in their reconstruction. Victory without the use for abundance of the powers we have developed in production for war would be, indeed, a hollow victory.

We must plan security and abundance together. Such a stronger American economy will be essential to carry out the responsibilities that lie in plans made at Bretton Woods, Hot Springs, and Dumbarton Oaks. Similarly, abundance at home depends upon organization for order and security in the world.

America is fortunate to have such a reaffirmation of the uninterrupted tradition of an advancing America enunciated by men who represent great organizations of labor, industry, and agriculture working together with others who represent the public. As such Americans chosen by the President and confirmed by the Senate, you have well stated the program by which we fight a victorious war and seek a meaningful peace.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, April 21, 1945.

Hon. O. MAX GARDNER,

Chairman, Advisory Board,

Office of War Mobilization and
Reconversion,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR GOVERNOR GARDNER: The letter which the President wrote to you in answer to your communication as Chairman of the Advisory Board of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion was the last statement officially issued by him with regard to his hopes and plans for reconversion. It was also, so far as our files disclose, the last statement of any sort which the President made on this subject.

I am happy, as I know your board is, that your communication gave the President the opportunity to make this final statement about the directions in which he hoped to see this Nation move in the great tasks at home which lie before us.

Sincerely,

JONATHAN DANIELS,
Secretary to the President.

VICTORY IN EUROPE—LIBERATION OF NORWAY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, when the glad news came this morning I issued two brief releases which I ask to have printed in the RECORD. One release relates to the victory in Europe, and the other to the liberation of Norway.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

There being no objection, the releases were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY HAILS VE-DAY

Victory has come in Europe. The news sends a thrill to every American heart. It stirs the deepest of pride in every American

breast. The hour for which we and our allies have longed, for which we have sweated and sacrificed these long years, is now at hand.

We have completed the long hard road to victory in the old world. This road was paved on the western and eastern fronts with our blood and treasure and that of our allies. In the west, it began by the American invasion of north Africa. It continued through Sicily, Italy, Normandy, the Siegfried Line, the Rhine, the Ruhr, and now to the last fallen fortress of the foe.

I congratulate the American people. I salute the citizens of the 48 States, particularly those of our State of Wisconsin, whose contribution to victory I know best. I pay tribute to our fighting Badger sons and daughters. To our farmers for their magnificent food production. To our industrial management and labor for their mountains of weapons, vehicles, and supplies. To the thousands in the trades and professions who carried on in every community. And to our parents, wives, and sweethearts who have so patiently borne the anxiety, the strain of separation from their loved ones in the armed services. I pay this sincere tribute to them all, in this, their hour, our hour, of triumph.

Yet, now we pause in reverent respect for the past and the future.

We pause in devoted memory to those of our own who gave their lives, their health, that this day might come to pass. We contemplate with sadness the untold millions of civilians and combatants among the other United Nations who have perished in the European and African struggle. We pray for divine aid that may lessen the sacrifices still to be made in the Pacific. We pray, too, for divine guidance that will assure that all of these sacrifices have not been in vain.

VE-day has come. Now if we resume our posts and carry on with renewed energy and rededicated purpose, VJ (victory in Japan) day will not be far distant. And, too, if our hearts are pure, our minds clear, and vision far seeing, there shall come one day soon VP-day, a day of the victory of the peace, a just and enduring peace.

We have paved a highway to victory across Europe with blood and treasure. We are still paving the highway to victory in the Pacific with blood and treasure. We must, lastly, pave a highway to a righteous and workable peace with faith and realism. We must fulfill the word of old in the Book of Books: "And the highway shall be there, and a way, and it shall be called the Way of Holiness."

SENATOR WILEY'S STATEMENT ON NORWAY

Norway is free.

Norwegian men and women—yes, and even children—have never relented in their determined battle for the ideals which they and we know to be right.

No nation has more justly deserved the fruits of freedom than Norway. The Norwegian underground has been a guide to the resistance movements of other occupied countries, and God has guided the Norwegian underground. In the air over Europe, in the seas about Europe, and on European battlefields, Norwegian fighting men have helped to speed the common victory. Norway has earned her place of honor in the community of free nations.

Norway is free?

No; rather Norway remains free while the invaders have surrendered. Norway, the courageous, was temporarily occupied. But Norway never has been conquered.

THE PROBLEM OF ATTAINING WORLD PEACE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the world is faced with the problem how to stop war from occurring a generation from now. To keep America out of war we will have to find the way to keep the world free from war. We have tried many ways.

We have tried treaties and pacts, and they have not done the job. We have tried disarmament, and it has not done the job. We have tried isolation, saying we will not fight, and that has not done the job. And just before we got into this war we tried embargoes, and that did not do the job. Then we lifted the embargo and that did not keep us out of war.

Now it is the problem of all humanity to find the way. We know that mere instrumentalities will not do the job. The finest mechanism that we can create at San Francisco will not by itself do the job. There must be back of it the will and the purpose and the desire of the contracting nations to fulfill the obligations of the pact, and we must find the way to see that that will and purpose shall obtain definitely and continuously in the years ahead.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House having proceeded to reconsider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 106) to amend section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, with respect to the deferment of registrants engaged in agricultural occupations or endeavors essential to the war effort, returned by the President of the United States with his objection, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, and it was resolved that the joint resolution do not pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives not agreeing to pass the same.

The message informed the Senate that Mr. FERNANDEZ had been appointed a manager on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1307) for the relief of Continental Casualty Co., a corporation, and Montgomery City Lines, Inc., vice Mr. COMBS, resigned.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 694. A bill to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic; and

H. J. Res. 177. Joint resolution repealing a portion of the appropriation and contract authorization available to the Maritime Commission.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 906) granting a franking privilege to Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

VE-DAY STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'DANIEL

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a VE-day statement which I have today released to the press and radio.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The prayers of millions of people throughout this world are being answered. One

phase of this most horrible of all wars is coming to an end.

We are profoundly thankful for this victory, but as the thunderous blasts of the mighty weapons of death and destruction fade into silence in Europe, let us not relax our vigilance and our efforts. The mighty task of finishing this war and rebuilding this shattered world, physically, economically, socially, and spiritually, will tax the brain and brawn of all peoples of all nations for many generations.

The peace-loving peoples of the whole world extend sympathy and condolence to the broken-hearted relatives of loved ones who made the supreme sacrifice in this fight for freedom. We also acknowledge our debt of gratitude to the returning heroes, many of whom are broken in body and health, and pledge to them the care and kindness which they so richly deserve. And to those who fight on to final victory and to the maintenance of world peace we renew our pledge of unstinted loyalty and all-out support to the last ounce of our ability and resources.

And, last but not least, if we are to keep faith with those who died, we come face to face with the supreme task of building a permanent world peace structure, so strong and secure, that no man or band of men can ever again plunge the peoples of this earth into war. To all those brave heroes who fought for the cause of freedom, and especially to those who made the supreme sacrifice, we who live owe that obligation, and in their memory, and with God's guidance, we must and we shall carry on until that goal is reached.

CONDOLENCES ON DEATH OF FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Chief, Division of Protocol, Department of State, transmitting a telegram from the American Ambassador to Yugoslavia, expressing condolences of the Anti-Fascist Council of National Liberation of Yugoslavia on the death of the former President of the United States Franklin D. Roosevelt, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the Democratic State Committee meeting in Dover, and the Jewish Federation of Delaware, Wilmington, both in the State of Delaware, expressing condolences on the death of the former President of the United States Franklin D. Roosevelt, which were ordered to lie on the table.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

BIRTHDAY OF SIMON BOLIVAR

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a resolution of the House of Representatives of the Republic of Cuba, inviting the Congress of the United States to send a delegation to participate in a birthday tribute to Simon Bolivar at Caracas, Venezuela, on July 24, 1945 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

A letter from the Assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a revised estimate of personnel requirements for the Office of the Secretary of Commerce, for the quarter

ending June 30, 1945 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 36

"Joint resolution relative to making President Roosevelt's birthday, January 30, a legal holiday

"Whereas our beloved President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, has been called by Providence to the Great Beyond; and

"Whereas his birthday, January 30, has long been a day devoted to a part of his many humanitarian efforts; and

"Whereas it is fitting and appropriate that January 30 should be declared a national holiday to be known as Roosevelt's Birthday in respect to the memory of Franklin Delano Roosevelt: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly). That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to declare January 30 a national holiday to be known as Roosevelt Birthday; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 35

"Joint resolution relative to income and resources of recipients of aid to the aged and of aid to the blind

"Whereas that provision of subdivision (a) of section 2 of title I of the Social Security Act which provides that 'a State plan for old-age assistance must * * * provide that the State agency shall, in determining need, take into consideration any other income and resources of an individual claiming old-age assistance' and the similar provision of subdivision (a) of section 1002 of title X of the act, relating to aid to the blind, are construed to require that the occupancy value of a home owned and occupied by a recipient of such assistance must be regarded as income or a resource of the recipient, and deducted from the amount of assistance to which he would otherwise be entitled; and

"Whereas the amount of these deductions is a comparatively small sum, so that the

amount of public money withheld from recipients for this reason is lost to the States and the United States Government by the increased cost of administration resulting from investigation and accounting to establish the amount of the deductions; and

"Whereas consideration of the occupancy value of homes of recipients as income or resources discourages thrift leading to home ownership: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly). That the Congress and President of the United States are hereby urged and memorialized to enact such amendments to the Social Security Act as will insure that ownership and occupancy of a home will not be considered income or resources of recipients of old-age assistance or of aid to the blind; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 31

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States and the Federal Surplus Property Board to establish or designate a special agency to which municipalities and other public bodies may deal in the purchase of Federal surplus properties

"By the Federal Surplus Property Act of 1944 an agency known as the Surplus Property Board was created and provision was made for the disposition of surplus property belonging to the Federal Government and its agencies.

"This law directs the Board to designate one or more agencies to act as a disposal agency for surplus property and, so far as the Board deems feasible, that it shall centralize in one disposal agency responsibility for the disposal of all property of the same type or class.

"It has been shown by the experience of counties, municipalities, and other public agencies in attempting to purchase Federal surplus property that the interests both of the Federal Government and its agencies and of the local bodies would be best served by setting up a separate department or agency to deal with cities and other political subdivisions and agencies with regard to the disposition of such property, more particularly of the classes of property which are likely to be in demand for the needs of such local bodies. Under the present organization, the responsibility for the disposition of such property is divided among several agencies and the resulting confusion is harmful to the interests of both the Federal Government and local political subdivisions and agencies: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly. That the President and the Congress of the United States and the Surplus Property Board are hereby respectfully requested to designate or establish by change in the law or by administrative action a single Federal agency to deal exclusively with cities and other political subdivisions and agencies desirous of acquiring such property; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be and he is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Senators, and Members of the House of Representatives from California."

A joint resolution of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Education and Labor:

"Senate Joint Resolution 3

"A joint resolution memorializing Congress to pass Senate bill 181 providing for equalization of educational opportunity

"Whereas Federal aid to education is vital to the maintenance of adequate educational opportunity throughout the war and a substantial aid to social and economic stabilization in the peace to come, and furthermore believing that the maintenance of the American system of private economy depends for its success upon the knowledge and skill and productivity of its individual citizens, that this makes it a responsibility of the Federal Government to assist in preparing its citizens in the performance of a national duty effectively: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

"1. That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky memorializes the Congress of the United States that it, at the earliest possible date, pass the Thomas-Hill bill (S. 181) to provide for an emergency aid to education, and for the equalization of educational opportunities among the several States.

"2. Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the President and Chief Clerk of the Senate of the United States, the United States Senators from Kentucky, the Speaker and Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and the Representatives in Congress from Kentucky."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

"Senate Resolution 12

"Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States, H. R. 2071, which provides for an increase in the compensation of certain postal employees, and also provides for other beneficial employment features for said employees; and

"Whereas said employees have received no increase in compensation for 20 years, with the exception of a small war bonus; and

"Whereas the Post Office Department has long been recognized as one of the most efficient and reliable of the Federal agencies, and the employees thereof should be rewarded for their capable and faithful service: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the senate, That the Senators and Representatives from Kentucky in the Congress of the United States are hereby urged to support and vote for the passage of H. R. 2071; and be it further

"Resolved, That this memorial be sent to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; ordered to lie on the table:

"Senate Resolution 13

"Resolution of respect and honor to the memory of our late President and Commander in Chief, Franklin D. Roosevelt

"Whereas our all-wise and infinite Creator has called from our midst and to his eternal reward our beloved and gallant leader, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, a man who, though physically handicapped, rose and stood preeminently as a commanding international figure, and who gave unstintingly of his time, talent, and brilliant ability to his own people and to the whole world, and who saw many of his plans executed, his ideals and ideologies incorporated into fundamentals, looking toward a better world of peace, friendship, and harmony among the people of the entire universe; and

"Whereas our illustrious commander fell on the firing line, only after the slender

thread of mortality was severed, at the crucial moment in world affairs, while facing the future confidently and unafraid. A man who was the peer of any man in the world, and whose discernment, viewpoints, and vision were international, yet whose heart was responsive to the welfare of the humblest citizen of our Nation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Kentucky in special session, Mindful of our irreparable loss, in the passing of our illustrious citizen, our matchless commander and beloved President, we do hereby express our deep sorrow and poignant grief; and be it further

"Resolved, That this senate tenders to the family of the late President Roosevelt its deep and abiding sympathy in this time of their great bereavement; that we do hereby pledge ourselves to strive to carry on and bring to fruition the principles for which he lived, fought, and died, and to keep his memory as a sacred heritage, his ideals enshrined in our hearts and lives; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread on the records of the proceedings of this body, and the clerk of this senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to the family of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and to the Clerks of the House and Senate of the Congress at Washington."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; ordered to lie on the table:

"Resolution of respect and honor to the memory of our late President and Commander in Chief, Franklin D. Roosevelt

"Whereas our all-wise and infinite Creator has called from our midst and to his eternal reward our beloved and gallant leader, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, a man who, though physically handicapped, rose and stood preeminently as a commanding international figure, and who gave unstintingly of his time, talent, and brilliant ability to his own people and to the whole world, and who saw many of his plans executed, his ideals and ideologies incorporated into fundamentals, looking toward a better world of peace, friendship, and harmony among the peoples of the entire universe; and

"Whereas our illustrious commander fell on the firing line, only after the slender thread of mortality was severed, at the crucial moment in world affairs, while facing the future confidently and unafraid. A man who was the peer of any man in the world, and whose discernment, viewpoints, and vision were international, yet whose heart was responsive to the welfare of the humblest citizen of our Nation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, Mindful of our irreparable loss in the passing of our illustrious citizen, our matchless commander, and beloved President, we do hereby express our deep sorrow and poignant grief; and be it further

"Resolved, That this house tenders to the family of the late President Roosevelt its deep and abiding sympathy in this time of their great bereavement; that we do hereby pledge ourselves to strive to carry on and bring to fruition the principles for which he lived, fought, and died, and to keep his memory as a sacred heritage, his ideals enshrined in our hearts and lives; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the journal of this house and the clerk of this house shall transmit a copy of this resolution to the family of the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, to the Clerks of the House and Senate of Congress at Washington, and to the press in Kentucky.

"This resolution was unanimously adopted by the house of representatives on April 30, 1945."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be and it is hereby respectfully requested to appropriate a sufficient amount of Federal funds to complete the following improvements in and to the harbor and port of Hilo, in the county and Territory of Hawaii, namely:

"1. To complete the dredging of Hilo Harbor and to deposit the dredged material, or so much thereof as may be necessary, behind a sea wall to be constructed parallel with the present shore line from the mouth of the Waialuku River to the mouth of the Waioa River.

"2. To construct a breakwater from the Wainaku side of Hilo Harbor of such length and in such direction as will protect the shipping in the harbor during certain prevalent winds and currents; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, to the Secretary of War, and to our Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Whereas the adjutant general of the National Guard of the several States are appointed by the respective Governors of said States; and

"Whereas by Federal law the adjutant general of the National Guard of the Territory of Hawaii is appointed by the President of the United States; and

"Whereas the adjutant general of the National Guard of the Territory of Hawaii is a territorial officer and it is suitable and desirable that he be appointed by the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the twenty-third session of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be and it hereby is respectfully requested and urged to amend the act of Congress approved June 3, 1916, entitled 'An act for making further and more effectual provision of the national defense, and for other purposes' (June 3, 1916, c. 134, 39 Stat. 166), by amending section 66 thereof so that said section shall provide that the adjutant general of the National Guard of the Territory of Hawaii shall be appointed by the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

"Whereas the people of Hawaii have down through the ages shown their aptitude for seafare; and

"Whereas it is inevitable that the United States Navy will be maintained at a greater strength than before the present global war; and

"Whereas Hawaii offers exceptional opportunities for recruiting men for the United States Navy: Now, therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-third Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be and it hereby is, requested to pass legislation to assure the maintenance in the Territory of Hawaii of a recruiting station for personnel for the United States Navy; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United

States of America, the President of the Senate of the United States of America, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States of America and Hawaii's Delegate to said House of Representatives."

A resolution adopted by the New York City (N. Y.) Colony of the National Society New England Women, commending the public expression of the President of the United States with respect to future cooperation between the executive and legislative branches of the Government; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Cambridge, Mass., favoring the enactment of House bill 3035, providing for an increase in the compensation of postal employees; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A resolution adopted by the Central Labor Council of Honolulu, T. H., favoring the enactment of legislation making it unlawful for any citizen, group of citizens, corporation, company, or anyone doing business in the United States to sell, lease, license, rent or in any way furnish anything which can be construed as a sinew for making war to any nation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Julius Hochfelder, major, Education Section, of the Army of the United States, retired, praying for the enactment of legislation for the creation of a school for the training of men and women for legislative posts similar to the institutions for officers of the Army and Navy as maintained at Annapolis, West Point, and the Consular and Diplomatic Services, in honor of Franklin D. Roosevelt (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens of Hutchinson, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 599) to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

PARTICIPATION OF THE UNITED STATES IN A WORLD ORGANIZATION OF NATIONS

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, in my home city of Burlington a public meeting, called a town meeting, was held on the 30th day of April, at which a resolution endorsing the active participation of the United States in a world organization of nations for the promotion and maintenance of security and peace, as formulated in the Dumbarton Oaks Agreement, was adopted. In the proceedings there was a discussion of an hour and a half preceding the vote, the vote was counted, a standing vote, in which 691 citizens voted "yes," no one voted "no," 6 did not vote, and a small number left the hall before voting began. I ask permission to present the resolution and that it be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution relating to active participation of the United States in a world organization of nations for the promotion and maintenance of security and peace

Resolved, That we, the citizens of Burlington, Vt., in meeting assembled, do hereby endorse the active participation of the United States in a world organization of nations for the promotion and maintenance of security

and peace, as formulated in the preamble of the Dumbarton Oaks Agreement; and further

Resolved, That the city clerk is hereby requested to forward copies of this resolution to the Members of the congressional delegation from Vermont and to the Secretary of State as representative of the United States at the San Francisco Conference.

STATE OF VERMONT, County of Chittenden, ss:

I, W. T. Abell, clerk of the city of Burlington, in said county and State, do hereby certify the foregoing resolution was adopted at a public meeting, called a "town meeting," of the citizens of Burlington, Vt., held April 30, 1945, at 8 o'clock in the evening.

Voting on adoption of the resolution, which followed 1½ hours of discussion, was by standing vote in which 691 citizens voted "yes," no one voted "no," 6 did not vote, and a small number left the hall before voting began.

Dated at Burlington, Vt., this 3d day of May, A. D. 1945.

Attest:

W. T. ABELL,
City Clerk.

[SEAL]

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a telegram I have received from H. J. Yount, secretary and treasurer of the Kansas State Industrial Union Council, Kansas City, Kans., favoring in principle a Missouri Valley Authority, as embodied in the Murray-Cochran bills now before the Congress.

There being no objection, the telegram was received, referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS CITY, KANS., April 16, 1945.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Kansas State Industrial Union Council believes the principle of a Missouri Valley Authority as embodied in the Murray-Cochran bills now before Congress will benefit all people in the State of Kansas. Only through the enactment of this legislation will there be unified development of the Missouri River and its basin, with balanced attention to flood-control irrigation and reclamation, the promotion of family type farming, navigation, power development, wildlife, and recreational potentialities, and the encouragement of industry. In addition to these benefits enactment of M. V. A. means jobs and security for thousands of Missouri Valley people in the critical post-war years.

KANSAS STATE INDUSTRIAL
UNION COUNCIL,

H. J. YOUNT,
Secretary and Treasurer,
Kansas City, Kans.

PRICE CONTROLS AND PROFITS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of the Kansas Farm Bureau at Manhattan, Kans., on April 19, and sent to each member of the Kansas delegation in Congress.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and

ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANHATTAN, KANS., April 19, 1945.

Resolved, That while recognizing the need of price controls to avoid inflation, it is our belief that such controls should be rescinded as soon after the termination of the war as possible; and in no event should Congress extend such controls for a period of more than 1 year at a time. Also a continuation of the provision that O. P. A. regulations shall not be used to limit profits.

KANSAS FARM BUREAU,
JULIA KING SMITH,
Secretary-Treasurer.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. OVERTON, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 1184. A bill to authorize Slater Branch Bridge and Road Club to construct, maintain, and operate a free suspension bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near Williamson, W. Va.; without amendment (Rept. No. 247); and

H. R. 1652. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Louisiana to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near New Orleans, La.; without amendment (Rept. No. 248).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 693. A bill for the relief of the Saunders Memorial Hospital; without amendment (Rept. No. 249).

EMERGENCY FLOOD RELIEF

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce I ask unanimous consent to report favorably without amendment the bill (S. 938) in reference to the emergency to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 245) thereon.

The bill has reference to the emergency flood-control relief and the report unanimously recommends the enactment of the bill.

Mr. President, this is an emergency measure, and I trust that I may be recognized tomorrow in order to bring the bill up for consideration and passage. I think it can be disposed of within a comparatively very short time. I hope there will be no opposition to it; there was none in the Senate Committee on Commerce. The bill follows the beaten path laid down in 1943 and 1944 relating to similar situations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and the bill placed on the calendar.

Mr. OVERTON subsequently said: Mr. President, I do not know at the moment whether the Senate will take a recess or will adjourn until tomorrow or some other day; but I desire to give notice, as I stated a while ago, that I wish to be recognized in order to request that the Senate take up the emergency flood-relief bill the next day the Senate convenes.

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce I ask unanimous consent to report with amendments the bill (S. 555) to establish a Missouri

Valley Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development on the Missouri River and surrounding region in the interest of the control and prevention of floods, the promotion of navigation and reclamation of the public lands, the promotion of family-type farming, the development of the recreational possibilities and the promotion of the general welfare of the area, the strengthening of the national defense, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 246) thereon.

It may be stated that this bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Commerce in order to consider the bill from the standpoint of navigation and flood control. The Commerce Committee did so; it considered the navigation and flood-control provisions and the provisions allied to navigation and flood control. It has recommended that all these provisions be stricken from the bill.

Then, Mr. President, the Committee on Commerce reports unfavorably on the bill as a whole. It has done so because it is rather difficult to segregate navigation and flood control from other projects in the valley. There is an intimate relationship between irrigation and flood control and between reclamation and flood control as well as navigation. The witnesses appearing both for the bill and against the bill, including the very able distinguished author of the bill, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], apparently took that view, because they presented their arguments for and against the bill in its entirety. The report is a unanimous one.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As the Chair is advised under a resolution of the Senate heretofore agreed to, the bill and report submitted by the Senator from Louisiana will have to go to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill and report will be so referred.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am very much interested in the report the Senator has just made on the so-called Missouri Valley Authority bill. The Senator will recall that during the time his committee was considering it, I had the honor and distinction and pleasure of presenting an amendment to the bill, and I should like to know whether my amendment has gone along with the original bill, or has he transmitted it to another committee?

Mr. OVERTON. It has fallen with the bill, so far as the Senate Committee on Commerce is concerned, but the amendment is still there, and, of course, can be considered by the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Is the amendment still with the Senator's committee?

Mr. OVERTON. No; it is not in my committee. The Senate Committee on Commerce did not act on it, for the

reason which appeared during the testimony of the able Senator from Colorado. His amendment was to segregate the Upper Missouri Basin from any direction or control of the proposed Missouri Valley Authority. When asked about the lower basin, he said he had no amendment with reference to the lower basin, but left it just as provided in the bill. Then it was suggested to him that probably he would agree with us and join us in killing the entire bill, and the Senator from Colorado said that that would be satisfactory to him; and we carried out his wishes, at least to that extent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes, but as I understand, the bill has not been killed; it has not been tabled; it has not been put in cold storage in the Committee on Commerce, but has been transmitted to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, and my question is, did my amendment go along with the bill to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation?

Mr. OVERTON. I think the Senator raises a parliamentary question. His amendment to the bill is here. It is to be considered as it was considered by the Senate Committee on Commerce. The Committee on Commerce reported unfavorably on the entire bill. The Senator's amendment, *ex necessitate rei*, follows the bill in its progress through the different committees to which it may be referred. His amendment would go to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, to be there considered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If my amendment is going forward with the bill, that is all I ask.

Mr. OVERTON. That is my understanding of the parliamentary situation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator for that assurance.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. As chairman of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, I should like to obtain some information.

Mr. OVERTON. I shall be very glad to give the Senator whatever information I can furnish him.

Mr. BANKHEAD. This is, of course, a very unusual situation, under which one bill is automatically ordered to three committees, regardless, I take it, of what action the first committee, the Committee on Commerce, may have taken, or what action the Senate Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation may take. I assume that if both adversely reported the bill, as the Committee on Commerce has already done, then it still would be required to go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator from Alabama is correct.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is a rather unusual situation. I do not see much advantage in the bill going to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation if its action will not have any effect on the final result. If ultimately the decision will rest with the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry as to whether the bill will come back to the Senate with a favorable or unfavorable report, then it seems to me the time of the Committee

on Commerce has been taken up unnecessarily, and the same would apply to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not know that I entirely agree with the able Senator from Alabama. The bill was referred to the Committee on Commerce to pass upon the navigation and flood-control features. The first thing the Committee on Commerce did was to recommend that there be stricken from the bill all provisions relating to navigation and flood control. Having done that, when the bill goes to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, I take it that that committee, as a committee, will have no jurisdiction over the question of navigation and flood control.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is one point about which I wanted information. The Committee on Commerce has, after hearings, stricken that provision from the bill.

Mr. OVERTON. It has recommended that every provision relating to flood control and navigation be stricken from the bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That leaves nothing, I understand, for the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation to consider or to act on—

Mr. OVERTON. We left the irrigation provisions intact.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It leaves nothing on the subject of flood control to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation?

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Then, suppose the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation took the same action so far as irrigation and reclamation was concerned; what would then go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which I am also a member?

Mr. OVERTON. The Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation would, if it followed the course pursued by the Committee on Commerce, recommend that there be stricken from the bill all provisions relating to irrigation and reclamation.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Are there provisions in the bill relating to agriculture and forestry?

Mr. OVERTON. There would be very little left for the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to pass on after the bill had been adversely reported by the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, if it should be adversely reported on.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is my understanding—and I will ask the Senator to confirm this if it is accurate—that the action of the Committee on Commerce in striking out all features of the bill relating to navigation and flood control was unanimous, and that the action of the committee in adversely reporting the rest of the bill was also unanimous.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator's understanding is correct.

Mr. BANKHEAD. After flood control and navigation matters had been stricken out, then the committee proceeded to make an adverse report. What consideration should the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, and ultimately the Committee on Agriculture and For-

estry, give to that adverse action on the bill as a whole by the very able Committee on Commerce?

Mr. OVERTON. I think that is a matter which would address itself to the sound discretion of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. The Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation can follow the precedent established by the Senate Committee on Commerce and make an adverse report on the bill as a whole, as well as making a report on the irrigation and reclamation provisions of the bill. Then it will go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and that committee will consider the bill from the standpoint of agriculture.

Mr. BANKHEAD. How much time was given by the Senator's committee to the consideration of the phases of the bill which the committee considered?

Mr. OVERTON. We divided equally the time between the proponents and the opponents, and everyone who desired to be heard was heard. There were a few statements of witnesses which were filed without being read to the committee in full.

Mr. BANKHEAD. How many days did the committee consume in the investigation?

Mr. OVERTON. Two weeks, and continuing sessions, morning and afternoon, with the exception, I think, of one afternoon, when no witnesses were present.

Mr. BANKHEAD. When will the hearings be available for our committee?

Mr. OVERTON. They are already printed and are available. I may say to the Senator from Alabama that the Committee on Commerce went very fully into all phases of the bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is what I was about to ask the able Senator—whether the committee went into irrigation and reclamation.

Mr. OVERTON. It did, and I will tell the Senator why. The first witness was the very able and distinguished author of the bill, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. He went into all aspects of the bill and into its provisions, and presented it as a whole, as well as from the standpoint of navigation and flood control. Then succeeding witnesses whom the proponents presented also went fully into the bill. When the opponents presented their side they also went fully into the provisions of the bill. I think the Senator from Alabama will find that it is very difficult to separate irrigation and reclamation from flood control and navigation. As the Senator well knows, every irrigation reservoir has flood-control factors connected with it, and all phases of the bill are so entwined that it is difficult to consider irrigation and reclamation separately from the other features of the bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The situation of the bill is something like that of one who, in legal parlance, is subject to double jeopardy.

Mr. OVERTON. The order of the Senate was carried out. I had no control over the situation. I simply followed the direction of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wish to urge the able Chairman of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation to hold hearings on this bill. The bill vitally affects irrigation in the West. We have considerable testimony which we wish to submit to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. When I say "we" I refer to that section of the West under irrigation which is affected by the provisions of the bill. I should like to have the opportunity to present testimony before the committee, and I hope such opportunity may be afforded.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I can assure the Senator from Colorado that the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation will proceed in an orderly way.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is all I ask.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. The discussion which has been taking place during the past few moments indicates the great difficulty which results from having a bill such as this sent to three separate committees. When the subject came up for consideration on the floor of the Senate in connection with the flood-control measure, I pointed out the difficulty which would arise and I did so again later when the bill itself was introduced. The subject was also gone into at great length on the floor of the Senate in 1937. But the Chairman of the Commerce Committee had filed a motion in the Senate that the bill be sent to the three separate committees. My understanding is, and I think the Record will bear me out, that the separate committees may consider the bill with respect to the particular matters over which they have jurisdiction, and that the findings of one committee are not binding upon the other committees. I do not understand that the Commerce Committee has any power to take action on the bill which will be binding upon committees which will subsequently consider the bill.

Mr. OVERTON. If the Senator will permit an interruption, I may say that the findings of the Commerce Committee will be binding only as they relate to flood control and navigation. I do not think the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation has any jurisdiction over those subjects. But our recommendations respecting the entire bill are not binding on any other committee.

Mr. MURRAY. I do not understand either that the Commerce Committee's recommendations with reference to flood control and navigation are binding, except as being advisory to the Senate, and when the bill is finally considered by the three separate committees and comes to the floor, then it is for the Senate to determine the entire matter.

Mr. OVERTON. Oh, unquestionably so.

Mr. MURRAY. So that none of the findings as they are made separately by the three committees will be binding until the Senate acts upon them.

Mr. OVERTON. The findings will certainly be like all committee reports. They are in the nature of recommendations.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes. I can see how very much better it would have been had

we followed the practice of the Senate which has been in vogue for the past quarter of a century, that is, to have the bill considered by one single committee, which committee, according to the precedents of the Senate, was the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It seems to me that would have been the correct procedure; but inasmuch as the Senate has adopted this practice, I want it to be made clear that the findings of the separate committees are not in any manner binding, but are merely advisory, and that the whole matter will be taken up when the bill comes to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. OVERTON. Certainly the recommendations of any committee of the Senate are merely advisory to the Senate. They are not binding on the Senate as a whole. The Senate can vote the proposed amendments up or down as it desires. I do not think there is any question at all about that.

In view of the argument just made by the Senator from Montana, and without any further discussion as to which committee should have been vested with jurisdiction over the whole subject matter, and also in view of the fact that one committee now has considered the bill in its entirety, and particularly in order to escape such criticism as that which the Senator from Montana makes of other committees considering the bill, which has been thoroughly considered by one committee, I wonder whether the Senator is proposing to suggest that all further hearings on the bill now terminate and that the bill come before the Senate for action.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair asks that Senators suspend debate for a moment, so that Senate Resolution 97, submitted by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] on March 12, 1945, which was agreed to on March 12, may be read by the clerk. The Chair asks Senators who are interested to take notice of the resolution, because the Chair is bound by it. The clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read Senate Resolution 97, as follows:

Resolved, That said bill, to wit, S. 555, shall be considered forthwith by the Committee on Commerce with respect to navigation and flood control, and thereafter returned to the Senate for reference to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, to be considered by said committee with respect to irrigation and reclamation, and thereafter shall be returned to the Senate for reference to the Committee on Agriculture for consideration with respect to the agricultural features thereof; be it further

Resolved, That said bill shall be reported on respectively by each of said committees within 60 days from the date of its reference to each of said committees and that the first 60-day period shall be calculated from the date of the passage of this resolution.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. In answer to the inquiry made by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana with reference to my position respecting the report submitted today by the Commerce Committee, I wish to say it is my idea that the procedure outlined in the resolution

which has just been read will have to be followed. The Senate took action by that resolution, and under the resolution the bill will now go to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, and after action by that committee the bill will go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. OVERTON. Of course that statement is absolutely correct, although by unanimous consent or by vote of the Senate, the resolution could be changed. I did not know exactly what the Senator from Montana had in mind in making the argument he made that a bill of this character ought to be considered only by one committee.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, Mr. President, whether we may have a week's notice before hearings are set on the bill before his committee.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I cannot assure the Senator that the committee can give him a week's notice of hearings, because

we are required within 60 days to make a report. Then there is another committee, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which must make a report on the bill. I do not know of any reason why I should give a week's notice before beginning hearings.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to have a week's notice, for I wish to bring witnesses from North Dakota to the hearings. Therefore I should like to have a week's notice of the hearings.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I can assure the Senator that he will have sufficient notice so he can bring his witnesses here before the hearings are closed.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I think the 60-day period under the resolution begins, so far as the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation is concerned, on May 15. The Commerce Committee is a few days ahead of the time limit in which to submit its report.

INVESTIGATION OF ECONOMIC AND OTHER CONDITIONS IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Territories and In-

sular Affairs, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 123) to investigate economic and other conditions in the Philippine Islands, and that it be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate for further study.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and the resolution referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate reports for the month of April 1945 from the acting chairman and chairmen of certain committees in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.) relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

MAY 7, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of April 1945, in compliance with the terms

of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
John F. Feeney.....	1425 Rhode Island Ave. NW.....	General Accounting Office, Washington, D. C.....	\$6,400
Harold E. Merrick.....	906 Aspen St. NW.....	do.....	4,800
Thomas J. Scott.....	1210 34th St. SE.....	Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.....	4,800
Mrs. Mamie L. Mizen.....	1434 Saratoga Ave.....	District of Columbia Government.....	3,500

KENNETH McKELLAR, Acting Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE

MAY 1, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

name of person employed by the committee who is not a full-time employee of the Senate or of the committee for the month of April 1945, in compliance with the terms

of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Mrs. Alma B. Kidwell.....	113 Park Blvd. SE., Washington, D. C.....	Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C.....	\$1,800.00

B. K. WHEELER, Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
May 1, 1945.

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR,
President pro tempore of the Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Pursuant to Senate

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Resolution 319, I am transmitting herewith a list of employees of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee who are not full time employees of the Senate. Included with this list is the name and address of each such employee, the name and address of the department paying the salary of such employee,

and the annual rate of compensation for each such employee.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee.

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Lucile Bryant.....	1016 16th St. NW., Washington, D. C.....	Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	\$2,100
Marion E. Dishaw.....	1738 M St. NW., Washington, D. C.....	Treasury Department.....	1,800
Betti C. Goldwasser.....	305 East George Mason Rd, Falls Church, Va.....	War Production Board.....	4,600

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WAR CONTRACTS

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
April 30, 1945.

HON. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
President, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Pursuant to Senate

Resolution 319, I am transmitting herewith a list of employees of the War Contracts Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs who are not full-time employees of the Senate. Included with this list is the name and address of each such employee, the name and address of the department

paying the salary of such employee, and the annual rate of compensation for each such employee.

Respectfully yours,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, War Contracts Subcommittee.

Name of individual.	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Kurt Borchardt.....	6007 34th PI NW., Washington, D. C.....	Smaller War Plants Corporation, Washington, D. C.....	\$5,600
Ward Bowman.....	Wilton Woods, Alexandria, Va.....	Justice Department, Washington, D. C.....	6,500
Ann Cheatham.....	4000 South Capitol St. SE., Washington, D. C.....	Smaller War Plants Corporation, Washington, D. C.....	2,000
Bertram M. Gross.....	613 South Quincy St., Arlington, Va.....	Navy Department, Washington, D. C.....	8,000
Hilda Hamilton.....	705 18th St. NW., Washington, D. C.....	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C.....	2,200
Doris Phippen.....	40 Plattsburgh Court NW., Washington, D. C.....	Navy Department, Washington, D. C.....	2,300

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MCKELLAR:

S. 961. A bill to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 to provide that a fair and equitable margin be allowed for processing agricultural commodities in fixing maximum prices; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER):

S. 962. A bill to provide assistance to the States in the establishment, maintenance, operation, and expansion of school-lunch programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 963. A bill authorizing the coinage of special 10-cent pieces in honor of Franklin Delano Roosevelt; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

S. 964. A bill to authorize the acquisition and operation of the Ovington Estate property in Olympic National Park, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. TYDINGS (by request):

S. 965. A bill to amend the Alaska Game Law; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 966. A bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 967. A bill to authorize an increase in the pay of the chaplain at the United States Military Academy while serving under reappointment for an additional term or terms; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 968. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to employ on part time clerks, stenographers, typists and machine operators holding positions in other Federal departments and agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 969. A bill to amend certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended;

S. 970. A bill to extend 5-year level premium term policies for an additional 3 years;

S. 971. A bill to amend section 100 of Public Law Numbered 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, June 22, 1944, to grant certain priorities to the Veterans' Administration, to facilitate the employment of personnel by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes;

S. 972. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to accept gifts, de-

vises and bequests in behalf of the General Post Fund for the use of veterans and for the sale and conveyance of any such property under certain circumstances and the covering of the proceeds thereof into the Post Fund, and for other purposes; and

S. 973. A bill to liberalize and clarify the laws pertaining to hospital treatment, medical care, domiciliary care and related services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado also introduced Senate bill 974, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BALL:

S. 975. A bill for the relief of Mike Chetkovich; and

S. 976. A bill for the relief of Mildred E. Waldron; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. CORDON) introduced Senate bill 977, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. J. Res. 63. Joint resolution to amend the Act of July 3, 1926, entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in claims which the Crow Tribe of Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes" (44 Stat. L. 807); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. J. Res. 64. Joint resolution to provide for collecting and publishing the writings of Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt; to the Committee on the Library.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION AND EDUCATION OF VETERANS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend parts VII and VIII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, to liberalize and clarify vocational rehabilitation and education and training laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes. I request that an analysis of the provisions of the proposed bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred and the analysis of the bill printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 974) to amend parts VII and VIII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, to liberalize and clarify vocational rehabilitation and education and training laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, and for

other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The analysis of the provisions of the bill presented by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado is as follows:

Sufficient time has elapsed since the enactment of Public Law No. 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved March 24, 1943, and title II of Public Law No. 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved June 22, 1944, which authorized vocational rehabilitation and education and training benefits for veterans of World War No. 2 who meet certain requirements of these acts to indicate that the administration of these benefits will be more equitable and greatly simplified if certain legislative changes are made. These changes have been incorporated in this draft of a bill and are as follows:

Section 1, if enacted, would permit the Administrator, in proper cases, to approve vocational rehabilitation training courses in excess of 4 years and also amends paragraph 1 of part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to extend the ultimate limit of training to 7 years after termination of the present war, instead of 6 years required by existing law. This will make the ultimate limitation for vocational rehabilitation under part VII the same period as is now provided for education or training under part VIII (par. 1, pt. VIII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended).

Existing law requires that books, supplies, or equipment furnished a trainee or student shall be released to him unless he fails because of fault on his part to complete the course of training. He may be required in such case, in the discretion of the Administrator, to return such books, supplies, or equipment. Experience has shown that there is no practical outlet for the disposition of such books, supplies, or equipment. Some educational institutions, however, are offering to accept the return of books, supplies, and equipment at a discount and to credit their accounts with the Veterans' Administration accordingly. Under existing law, this cannot be done. If the Veterans' Administration were enabled to dispose of returned property in this matter, administrative procedure would be simplified and a saving would be accomplished. Section 2 of the bill is proposed to accomplish this purpose and will, if enacted into law, permit the Administrator to turn in returned books, supplies, or equipment to educational or training institutions for credit upon such terms as may be approved by the Administrator, or that they may be disposed of in such manner as may be approved by the Administrator.

Section 3 of the bill increases the rates payable to those veterans found eligible for vocational rehabilitation. The rates stated in the bill include an increase in the basic rate and also the 15-percent increase authorized by Public Law No. 312, Seventy-eighth Congress, May 27, 1944. This section would also remove a provision which has caused dissatisfaction among employers extending training on the job.

Paragraph 3 of part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, now requires that the employer must submit monthly a statement under oath showing any payments paid by him to the vocational trainee. Section 3 of this bill would amend that paragraph to require only written statements.

Section 4, if enacted into law, would greatly simplify the administration of title II of Public Law No. 346, Seventy-eighth Congress. Section 4 amends paragraphs 1, 2, 6, and 7 of part VIII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to remove the distinction between education and training and refresher and retraining courses. This distinction has proved very difficult of administration and confusing to veterans applying for education and training. The section would also, if enacted into law, remove the distinction between those veterans under 25 and those over 25 years of age at the time of entrance into service. It has been found that the distinction between these two age groups has caused considerable dissatisfaction among the veterans, it has given rise to much misunderstanding of the purposes of the act, and increases the complexity of administration. It is not considered that the removal of this distinction would effect much increase in the ultimate cost of the educational provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 and such increase as might be effected would be offset by the simplification of administration. The section would also remove the distinction in existing law between the first year of education or training or refresher and retraining course and courses for subsequent years and make the basic entitlement of all persons not to exceed the time such person was in active service on or after September 16, 1940, and before the termination of the war, exclusive of such periods as he was assigned for a course of education or training under the Army specialized training program or the Navy college training program, which course was a continuation of his civilian course and was pursued to completion or as a cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies as is provided by existing law. However, the section would permit the election of a course of education or training which would require less than the full period of eligibility. The limit of any period of education or training to 4 years would be continued.

Section 4 further provides certain regulatory limitations that appear advisable. It will, if enacted into law, provide that subsistence allowances may not be paid in an amount which, together with the benefits paid, would exceed the amount payable under part VII, and it will also provide that any veteran eligible for training under part VIII who is also eligible for vocational rehabilitation under part VII may elect either benefit as is now provided by law, and, in addition, he may be provided an approved combination of such courses provided that the total period of such combined courses shall not exceed the maximum period of limitations under the part elected.

Section 5 would, if enacted into law, permit the Administrator to approve short intensive postgraduate or vocational training courses for a period less than the generally recognized school year and contains certain safeguards to prevent advantage being taken of veterans by improperly equipped institutions and also permits the payment of reasonable and fair rates for instruction and material. It also provides that for the purposes of this provision such postgraduate or

vocational training course shall be deemed the equivalent of one ordinary school year of education or training.

This section would also permit the election of a course of instruction by correspondence with similar safeguards and without authorizing the payment of any maintenance allowance in such cases.

Section 6 modifies the last proviso of paragraph 5 with reference to the adjustment and payment of fees and charges to educational and training institutions. This amendment appears to be necessary in order to clarify what is meant by fair and reasonable compensation for education and training at certain institutions and to afford necessary flexibility in the matter of authorizing the payment of fees by the Administrator. It is considered that the provisions as drawn protects the Government against excessive charges and also permits a fair adjustment on behalf of educational institutions. The section also defines the term "ordinary school year" and further clarifies the provision relative to intensive postgraduate, vocational, or trade course.

Section 7 is a formal provision relating to the effective date of the bill if enacted into law.

HOUSING FOR VETERANS ATTENDING EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have been working with a veterans' group and a group of college and civic leaders with regard to a particular bill I am about to introduce, and with regard to which I wish to make some explanatory remarks. A news release went out this afternoon on the subject, so in order to include the contents of that release in today's RECORD, I shall appreciate it if those who have honored me by staying will permit me to take a few minutes for a brief comment with regard to this very important bill. I shall speak at some length later on the bill when it is reported by the committee to which it is referred.

Mr. President, I am introducing a bill to aid in providing housing for veterans attending educational institutions, and for other purposes. I am introducing it in my behalf and in behalf of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. The bill we are introducing has been drafted to meet the need for housing for student veterans who are attending universities under provisions of the GI bill. It provides a three-way plan, so that it will fit every section of the country and so that it can be adjusted to the particular requirement of any authorized educational institution which may be attended by veterans under the bill.

The three-way plan embodies the following:

First. Loans to public agencies. This means any State, county, municipality, or other Government agency or public body, or any educational institution approved under the GI bill which is authorized to engage in the development of a housing project.

Loans made to public agencies shall bear interest at the rate of 2 percent. The housing authority under this section will approve rentals it deems to be fair, and the rental charged veterans will then be reduced below the established rental by an amount equal to 50 percent thereof, except that the reduction shall not exceed \$15 a month for single veterans or \$30 a month for a veteran and his family. Such reduction shall be credited

by the authority as a payment on the loan.

There is a maximum of \$4,000 per family dwelling unit except in cities where the population is over 500,000, and in this event the maximum is \$5,000 per family dwelling unit.

Second. The second approach is by the construction of housing at educational institutions by the United States under the Lanham Act, with the same provisions for reduced rentals for the veterans as in the case where loans are made for the construction of housing.

Third. The third approach is that where no living quarters are made available at reduced rentals under this act for veterans and their families, their subsistence allowance shall be increased by \$15 a month for veterans without dependents and \$30 per month for veterans with dependents.

It is possible now for educational institutions to obtain self-liquidating loans from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The usual policy of the R. F. C., however, is to charge 4 percent and it would require special authorization from the directors to reduce this amount. The interest rate provided for in the bill I am introducing is 2 percent, and there are the further benefits above indicated to assist educational institutions in providing housing.

I think it is urgent for the Congress to enact legislation of this character because unless it does so, the educational provisions of the GI bill in many instances will be valueless because the sum provided under this bill will be used up for housing accommodations and there will be little left for tuition and other college expenses. If our boys are to get the benefits of advanced education, we must do something to see that they can house themselves and their families at a moderate rental.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that I have been working on this subject not only with college administrators but with leaders of veterans' groups, who recognize that although the motives of Congress were of the very highest in passing the so-called GI bill, the bill is in need of extensive revision if it is to accomplish the ends sought by those motives. This is particularly true in the educational sections of the present law. Although it is conceived to be desirable to give veterans the advantage of college training, under the educational sections, it is now practically impossible for them to obtain such training under the money allowances of the act. There are very few college towns in which veterans who have families can rent accommodations for less than \$50 or \$60 a month. It should be remembered their entire allowance is only \$75 under the GI Act.

I think it is also important that we keep in mind the fact that the educational sections of the GI Act have great rehabilitative value. I can think of no better place for veterans who are seeking an education to make their readjustment to civilian life than on the campuses of American universities. So I believe it is important that we so amend the act as to enable veterans to attend college and have their families with them, living in decency and as a part of the university

community. I should not want them scattered all over the town or the surrounding areas, living in basements and attics, and places of exceedingly low rental value. We should give them what they are entitled to, and it seems to me that on this historic day we can well afford to direct our attention to making good with regard to the great debt of gratitude we owe to the living veterans who are winning the fight to keep America free.

I think we need to go through the G. I. law and amend those features which now make it impossible for the veterans really to take advantage of what Congress had in mind when the law was passed. I have attempted to draft a bill which will make it possible for veterans to obtain an education, and actually live on the campuses of American universities with their families.

Mr. President, I make one further point in conclusion. This is not the only section of the G. I. law which needs immediate revision by the Congress. I wish to urge the importance of immediate action in regard of veterans' legislation. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an editorial from the Portland Journal, written by Mr. R. F. Owen. Mr. Owen was formerly a lieutenant commander in the United States Navy. He gives a very interesting account of the experiences which he has had to go through in an attempt to take advantage of the loan provisions under the G. I. law. I know that most Senators have received correspondence, as I have, to the effect that the loan provisions are not working out to the benefit of the veterans. They may be working out to the benefit of some loan agencies and office holders, but not to the benefit of the veterans.

I have sought in the bill I am introducing to amend—really to implement—the educational sections of the G. I. law. I am endeavoring to accomplish in this bill the type of thing which I think we need to do with most of the other sections of the law. Possibly the law should be rewritten, but it can be amended intelligently, and I have sought to do it so far as providing low-cost housing for veterans under the educational sections of the act is concerned. At a later date, if other Senators do not see fit to do so, I shall offer further amendments to the GI law in regard to its loan sections, and also in connection with medical attention and hospitalization for veterans. I also think that the time limitations of the GI Act need to be greatly liberalized as indicated by Mr. Owens in his splendid editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE GI BILL FAILS
(By Roy F. Owen)

I am mad, hurt, and concerned over the GI loan bill. It means exactly nothing in a financial way but one more great big headache for this country to face with its returning soldiers and sailors.

Before I was released from active duty with the Navy, we held meetings to instruct the men in what they would be entitled to upon their discharge and release. The GI loan

bill, we said, provides for a loan up to \$2,000 guaranteed by the Government for either purchase of real property or for use in getting started in business of some kind.

Upon my release I decided to test the effectiveness of the bill. I am not personally in need of money but I wanted to see for myself what the GI bill provided. I went to the Veterans' Administration in Portland to inquire as to procedure to be followed in securing a loan. I was at once referred to a bank, any bank, for origination of the loan and to secure and complete the necessary forms. I went to a banker I personally know well. He referred me to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in this city. The gentlemen at the R. F. C., after questioning me at some length as to the purpose of the loan—a business one—advised me of several things:

1. The R. F. C. does not lend money—only approves loans made.
2. No loan can be made unless and until a bank refuses the loan.
3. No loan can be made without good collateral.
4. No consideration can be given one's professional reputation or record of success.
5. Any loan must be applied for within 2 years of separation from service.
6. The R. F. C. cannot even consider an application for a loan until the veteran has completed a series of forms that go from the R. F. C. to the Veterans' Administration in Portland to the Veterans' Administration in Seattle and from there to an office in New York and then either back through the same chain or to somewhere else.

Now, if one had good collateral, he would not need a GI loan, but could go to the bank and get whatever money was needed within the limit of his credit.

The 2-year clause means loans, if and where granted, will be on real estate at an inflated value, or we force the veterans to buy real estate, thus forcing an inflated value.

There is a contradictory angle that says loans under the GI bill cannot be made on property bought at more than its reasonable normal value. Where can anyone find property now that sells at a normal valuation?

Lastly, our returning soldiers and sailors will, in the main, be youngsters. They are not ready to buy homes and settle down or go immediately into business for themselves. Yet, if they practice the caution of waiting, the 2 years will expire before they receive any benefit from the GI bill.

Framers of the bill may have had the welfare of our servicemen at heart. But they certainly bungled the instrumentality of the legislation. It should be amended before it defeats its purpose by breaking rather than making morale.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent to introduce the bill, and to have it appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 977) to aid in providing housing for veterans attending educational institutions, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. CORDON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 694. A bill to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

H. J. Res. 177. Joint resolution repealing a portion of the appropriation and contract

authorization available to the Maritime Commission; to the Committee on Appropriations.

DIPLOMATIC PROTECTION OF AMERICAN PETROLEUM INTERESTS ABROAD

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a monograph which has been prepared by Mr. Henry S. Fraser, chief counsel for the Special Committee Investigating Petroleum Resources, be printed as a Senate document. It is a study of diplomatic protection of American petroleum interests abroad, a very valuable and scholarly presentation of this matter, which I believe should be available to all Members of the Senate. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

JEWISH RIGHTS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WAGNER

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at a mass rally for Jewish rights held under the joint auspices of the American Jewish Conference and American Zionist Emergency Council, at Lewisohn Stadium, New York, April 29, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT IS THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE?—ARTICLES BY SENATOR SALTONSTALL, SENATOR WILEY, AND GOV. ELLIS ARNALL, OF GEORGIA

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a symposium entitled "What Is the American Way of Life?" containing articles by Senator Saltonstall, Senator Wiley, and Gov. Ellis Arnall, of Georgia, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEDICATION OF THE NEW WOODROW WILSON HOUSE—ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPHUS DANIELS AND STATEMENT BY ARTHUR SWEETSER

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Josephus Daniels at the dedication and opening of the new Woodrow Wilson House in New York City on April 17, 1945, and also a statement by Mr. Arthur Sweetser, president of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, on the same occasion, which appear in the Appendix.]

RIVER BASIN AUTHORITIES AND THE NEW COMMUNITY—ADDRESS BY HON. LELAND OLDS

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "River Basin Authorities and the New Community," delivered by Hon. Leland Olds, Vice Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, before the Washington Academy of Sciences, Washington, D. C., on April 19, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. OSCAR R. EWING AT NATIONAL RALLY OF THE UNITED AMERICANS FOR UNITED NATIONS

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Oscar R. Ewing, vice chairman, Democratic National Committee, at the National Rally of the United Americans for United Nations at New York City on April 25, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

BREAD, NOT STONE—ARTICLE FROM THE STARS AND STRIPES

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Bread, Not Stone," published in the

Stars and Stripes of April 11, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

OBLIGATION OF A HOME-FRONT SOLDIER

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Till the Last Shot Is Fired—My Obligation as a Home-Front Soldier," issued by the I Am an American Foundation, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE EDUCATION OF DENTISTS IN WARTIME—EDITORIAL FROM JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN DENTAL ASSOCIATION

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Education of Dentists in Wartime," published in the last issue of the Journal of the American Dental Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

THEY SHALL NOT MARCH ALONE—ARTICLE BY CHAPLAIN GROVER C. SCHWARTZ

[Mr. BILBO asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "They Shall Not March Alone—The Spirit of the American Chaplain," by Chaplain Grover C. Schwartz, published in the March 1945 issue of the Mississippi Veteran, which appears in the Appendix.]

SALARY INCREASE FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS—LETTER FROM NEW YORK BOARD OF TRADE

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from John B. Glenn, president of the New York Board of Trade, Inc., on the subject of a salary increase for Members of Congress, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTROL AND TREATMENT OF INFANTILE PARALYSIS

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the control and treatment of infantile paralysis, delivered by Sister Kenny before the Illinois State Legislature, which appears in the Appendix.]

WORLD POWER CONCEPTS—ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "World Power Concepts Unfolding at Parley," written by David Lawrence, which appears in the Appendix.]

JUSTICE FOR THE POSTMAN—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK DAILY MIRROR

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Justice for the Postman," published in the New York Daily Mirror of April 28, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

A SQUARE DEAL FOR POSTAL WORKERS—EDITORIAL AND LETTER FROM BOSTON DAILY RECORD

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Square Deal for Postal Workers," together with a letter from William C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, published in the Boston Daily Record of April 21, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXEMPTION OF FARM WORKERS FROM SELECTIVE SERVICE—ACTION BY REPUBLICANS IN CONGRESS ON VETO BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an editorial entitled "The Republicans in Congress Write Another Chapter," published in the New York Times of May 5, 1945. I have been debating whether to ask unanimous con-

sent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD, because it analyzes a vote in the House of Representatives on the first veto message of the President of the United States. I myself have made no such analysis. I have never examined a vote in either branch of the Congress from a partisan or political standpoint. However, reading this editorial disturbs me. I am disturbed at the thought which is implied; and because I am disturbed, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD, and urge that it receive the most careful consideration of every Member of the minority party.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REPUBLICANS IN CONGRESS WRITE ANOTHER CHAPTER

For the sake of the record it is important to note the action of the Republicans in the House of Representatives on the first veto of a bill by President Truman.

The issue was whether blanket exemption from the Selective Service Act should henceforth be granted to all farm workers, thereby establishing an especially favored group of citizens.

President Truman properly vetoed this proposal. His own party in the House of Representatives voted to sustain him in this veto by a majority of 164 to 30.

And what did the House Republicans do? They voted 154 to 12—more than 12 to 1—to override the veto. Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts, Republican leader, led the way.

The same old stupid business goes on of looking for political advantage by "voting against the President." Now in the record of the House Republicans a new item of opposition is added to a record that already includes opposition to repeal of the arms embargo, opposition to selective service, opposition to renewal of selective service, opposition to the Hull trade program, opposition to lend-lease.

It is a curious thing the way a Republican candidate for the Presidency bobs up every 4 years and then seems surprised because the independent voters of the country don't rush to support the Republican Party "on its record."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as I understand, this is an editorial which criticizes the Republicans in the House.

Mr. HATCH. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. It criticizes the Republicans in the House for voting to override the President's veto of a bill to exempt farm laborers. The bill was passed unanimously by the Senate. As I remember the circumstances, every Member of this body approved it. It was supported and put through by the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and received the unanimous support of this body.

An editorial which criticizes the Republican Party in the House for voting for a measure which was unanimously approved by this body, and which met the active support and approval of many of the members of the majority party here, as well as the minority party, may be a proper element in the RECORD; but I should like to call attention to the facts behind this particular measure.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to have it definitely understood that I make no criticism of anyone. However, I read the editorial with deep concern, because it shows a marked partisan division, a

thing which I dislike, especially when I review in my own mind the questions which will confront this country in the months ahead. I submit the editorial for the consideration of all Members of Congress, for whatever it may be worth.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest that when the Republican Members voted against the convictions which they held all along, that was far less partisan than the vote by majority Members in the House of Representatives, who formerly had one view, and, simply because the President happened to veto the bill, were willing to change their views and refuse to vote for the bill again. That certainly was more of a partisan exhibition than the action of the Republicans in the House.

PLANNING OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION PROJECTS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement in connection with Senate bill 89. Last week I advised the Senate that I would move to take up that bill following the disposition of the bill which was then before the Senate.

Today I learn that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], who is chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, is unavoidably out of the city on official business. I shall therefore not move to take up the bill today, but probably will do so on Thursday. As I understand, the Senator from Oklahoma is expected to return by that time.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I can well understand why the Senator from Illinois would not wish to bring up the bill today, in the absence of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I shall be glad to cooperate with the Senator in obtaining consideration of the bill on Thursday.

As soon as the Senate shall have finished the business on the calendar in executive session, I shall move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business, with the intention of taking up for consideration at that time the motion of the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to reconsider the vote by which the so-called Tydings-Bilbo hospital construction bill passed the Senate a few days ago.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, let me say that a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys is planning to hold hearings in New Mexico and Arizona, which will run through the 15th of May. I do not know whether or not the chairman of the committee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] will make a similar request; but on my own behalf I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate during the hearings, which will last approximately a week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota? The Chair hears none, and the request is granted.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, tomorrow several members of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys will be compelled to leave Washington in connection with committee hearings. They

will be detained in the West for probably a couple of weeks. For myself, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], I ask unanimous consent that we may be excused from attendance on duties of the Senate during that period of absence.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and consent of the Senate is granted.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nomination of W. Coy St. John, to be postmaster at Manchester, Tenn., in place of Hugh Doak, resigned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Foreign Service.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations in the Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Foreign Service nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTER GENERAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert E. Hannegan, of Missouri, to be Postmaster General.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nomination of Postmaster General be temporarily passed over, until the routine nominations are confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the routine postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BALL. I ask that the nomination of Thomas J. Kosanda, to be postmaster at Hopkins, Minn., be excepted from that request. I desire to make a brief statement regarding the nomination.

Mr. McKELLAR. That will be satisfactory.

Mr. HILL. I so modify my request to have the postmaster nominations confirmed en bloc, and I ask that with the exception noted by the Senator from Minnesota, they be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination for postmaster at Hopkins, Minn., will be temporarily passed over. Without objection, the remaining postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

The clerk will now state the first nomination which has been passed over.

POSTMASTER GENERAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert E. Hannegan, of Missouri, to be Postmaster General.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I request a vote on the nomination.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, at the conclusion of my remarks it will be my intention to request that, by unanimous consent, the nomination of Robert E. Hannegan to be Postmaster General be recommitted to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. I do not make that request at this time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of permitting me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Hayden	Overton
Ball	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hill	Reed
Billbo	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Briggs	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Buck	Kilgore	Russell
Burton	La Follette	Shipstead
Bushfield	Langer	Smith
Butler	Lucas	Stewart
Capper	McFarland	Taft
Chavez	McKellar	Taylor
Cordon	McMahon	Tunnell
Donnell	Maybank	Tydings
Downey	Millikin	Walsh
Ellender	Mitchell	White
Ferguson	Moore	Wiley
Green	Morse	Wilson
Gurney	Murdock	Young
Hart	Murray	
Hatch	O'Daniel	

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I announce that my colleague, the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], is absent, having gone to North Carolina to fulfill an engagement at a commencement occasion. He will return, so he told me, on Wednesday.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent inspecting concentration and prison camps in Europe.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] are absent on official business for the Senate Naval Affairs Committee.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the

Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent as a delegate to the International Conference in San Francisco.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senators from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN and Mr. FULBRIGHT] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is attending to public business pertaining to his State.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are absent on official business visiting various concentration and prison camps in Europe.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business as a delegate to the International Conference at San Francisco.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official committee business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are detained in committee meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, as I indicated a few moments ago, it is my intention at the conclusion of my remarks to ask unanimous consent that the nomination of Robert E. Hannegan to be Postmaster General of the United States be recommitted to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. It is my further intention, in the event that the reference be made, to ask the committee to hold public hearings on the nomination, to which hearings Mr. Hannegan, as well as other witnesses, shall be invited or summoned.

At this time I propose to address my remarks to certain reasons why the nomination should be recommitted to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and why hearings should be held.

The first of the reasons why recommitment to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads should be had is that this nomination has not been presented at a hearing of that committee. On May 3, the nomination was reported to the Senate. On May 3, a paper, a copy of which I have in my hand, was passed around among some but not all of the members of the committee. That paper was signed by 11 of the 19 members of the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The statement of the Senator from Missouri is correct that 11 members of the committee signed the report. They were composed of both Democrats and Republicans. Only one of them objected at the time, and he afterward withdrew his objection. So in making its report the committee, by following the method of polling its members, did only what has been done for—I can only speak for the 29 years during which I have been a Member of the Senate—a great many years. Such method has been an accepted custom in determining the views of the committee on nominations submitted to it.

Mr. MORSE and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield first to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I am very glad to hear the explanation just made by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee because, as a freshman in the Senate, I am not familiar with Senate committee polling methods. As a member of the committee, I was not polled. I wish to say, however, that if the custom to which the Senator has referred has been pursued for the past 29 years, it is about time that it be changed. I think that when we are asked to consider an appointment as important as that of a Postmaster General, each and every member of the committee should be consulted. I have ascertained that I was present on the floor of the Senate at the time the so-called polling took place. In my judgment, each and every member of the committee should have been polled; but it seems to me that sound practice would have called for a meeting of the committee for a full discussion of an appointment so vital to the interests of this country as is the appointment of a person to be a member of the Cabinet.

Later I shall speak with reference to what criteria I think should be applied in connection with determining the qualifications of a person who has been appointed to a Cabinet position. I believe the Senate is well aware of the position I took on a previous occasion with regard to the President's prerogatives when an appointment to a Cabinet position is made. But I do not think that such an appointment should be confirmed until there has been afforded full and adequate opportunity for the committee to hold hearings.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, it seems to me that it was only a short time ago when we had before us for consideration the nomination of Mr. Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce. As I now recall, the Senator from Oregon then argued that the President, having sent to the Senate the nomination of a person to be a member of his Cabinet, should have the right to have the nomination confirmed as a matter of course.

Mr. MORSE. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee could not be more

mistaken with regard to my views on any matter than his remarks just spoken show him to be in regard to my views in connection with the Wallace nomination.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Oregon voted for Mr. Wallace.

Mr. MORSE. I was one who believed, on the basis of the criteria which had been established throughout the history of this country in regard to Cabinet appointments, that Mr. Wallace's nomination should be confirmed by the Senate, and I so voted. I shall not at this time discuss those criteria. However, as a Member of the Senate on this side of the aisle, I was one who insisted that Mr. Wallace's qualifications be determined by those criteria. After the lengthy committee hearings on Mr. Wallace, I became convinced that Mr. Wallace met those tests. I am not saying that Mr. Hannegan cannot meet them; I merely assert that they should be applied to his nomination. Hence, in fairness to Mr. Hannegan and President Truman, I think that the Senator from Tennessee, as chairman of the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee, should call a meeting of the committee for a determination of the procedure which should be followed by the committee in this matter.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, without discussing the question as to the wisdom of the practice of polling committees—and I may say parenthetically that I think it is a very bad practice—I believe that the nomination of every important officer which is sent to the Senate should be considered at a meeting of the committee to which the nomination has been referred. I think that notice of the appointment should be given in order that all Members of the Senate may come before the committee and object to the nomination or request that hearings be held. But apart from that, it has also been the practice, so far as I know, that when an appointment is reported to the Senate, before any action is taken upon it, it is submitted to the Senators representing the State from which the appointee comes for their comment and advice.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] was not consulted in connection with this appointment. He was a member of the committee, but he was not polled until after a large majority of the committee had already signed the report. If we are to follow the practice to which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has referred, I submit that the practice was ignored in this particular case.

Mr. McKELLAR. The clerk of my committee, acting under my instruction, did poll the Senator from Missouri. I do not know whether he signed the report, but both Senators from Missouri were advised of the nomination.

I may say very frankly that it never occurred to me that Mr. Hannegan would not meet the requisite qualifications for the high office of Postmaster General. I never dreamed that any objection would

be made to his nomination. I was astonished when objection was made. A few Senators were consulted, and the committee was polled in the usual and everyday way in which such polls have been conducted during the past 29 years I have been a Member of the Senate. In fact, the same method was pursued many years before I became a Member of the Senate.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, with respect first to the statement of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee as to the custom which has prevailed, I understood him to say that such custom had prevailed with respect to the nomination of postmasters. I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that this appointment does not concern alone a Postmaster General. The appointment is of a member of the Cabinet of the President of the United States. I further invite attention to the fact that with the exception of the incident, to which I shall advert in a moment, the matter was never mentioned to me either directly or indirectly.

On the 3d day of May, which was the date on which the nomination was reported to the Senate, a gentleman whose identity I do not know, but whom I judged to be the clerk of the committee, or an assistant, came to my desk and handed me a paper or card upon which appeared various signatures. He made mention of the fact that the card or paper related to the appointment of Mr. Hannegan, and inquired in substance whether I would sign it. I looked at the paper and told him that I would not sign it; that I desired to consider the matter before determining what I should do. The paper was never again presented to me. My signature is not upon it. I do not know how many Members of the Senate or of the committee had already signed the paper when it was presented to me. I do know, however, that upon such paper or card, over the signature of the Honorable WILLIAM LANGER, United States Senator, appeared the words: "Opposed, and want a hearing."

I undertake to state further that this request of the Senator from North Dakota, whether withdrawn or not by him, was never submitted to the committee. I undertake to supplement the remarks made by the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Ohio, for which I am grateful, by stating that, in my judgment, when a member of a committee of the United States Senate asks for a hearing upon the question of the appointment of a member of the Cabinet of the President of the United States, it would appear to me certainly to be right and at least courteous to call the committee together and present the request of the Senator to the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. When the clerk of the committee called on the Senator from Missouri, who is now speaking, and showed him the poll of the committee, and asked him to sign or do whatever he wished to do about it, did the Senator

from Missouri request of the clerk that a hearing be held?

Mr. DONNELL. No, sir; I do not regard the clerk of the committee as the committee itself. I was handed this document which had at the bottom of it over the names which are there signed the words "With the recommendation that the nomination be confirmed." The paper or card did not indicate at any place that it was designed to be the document upon which there should be contained a request for a hearing; but the Senator from North Dakota inscribed on it the words I have quoted. I did not sign the paper, and the request of the Senator from North Dakota for a hearing was never communicated to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. After the Senator had notified the clerk of the committee that he would not sign the slip of paper that had been shown him did the chairman of the committee at any time thereafter suggest to the Senator from Missouri that there would be a committee meeting to consider the Senator's objections?

Mr. DONNELL. My statement to the gentleman who, I assumed, was the clerk of the committee, was that I would not sign it, and neither then nor thereafter have I ever heard from the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee requesting me to indicate whether I would sign or whether I desired a hearing.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

I discussed the matter with several Members of the Senate, but there has been no meeting of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads to consider the request of the Senator from North Dakota, and, as I have indicated, the paper, signed as it was by only 11 members of the committee, only 10 of whom approved the nomination, does not, in my judgment, constitute action of the committee, regardless of the practice which the distinguished Senator from Tennessee and other Senators say has prevailed.

I now yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, it just happens that the chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was in the Senate the entire afternoon, and he remembers very distinctly not only having seen the Senator from Missouri in the Chamber, but having seen him in the Chamber practically all afternoon. The Senator from Missouri, having received the usual ordinary report, made in the usual ordinary way and signed in the usual ordinary way, does he not think that if he had any reason for making objection or wanting a hearing it would have been the simplest matter for him to have gone to the chairman of the committee and so expressed himself? The chairman of the committee, because he happens to be chairman, is still a Member of the Senate; he is exceedingly friendly to the Senator from Missouri, and would have been glad if the Senator

from Missouri at the time had made such an objection or such a claim to have had it go before the committee; but the Senator was perfectly silent on the subject on the day the action was taken.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. I should like first to answer the Senator from Tennessee. In my judgment, the proper procedure for me to follow is that which I am following, namely, to present upon the floor of the Senate, which I shall do, a request for unanimous consent that the nomination of Mr. Hannegan be recommitted to the committee.

I now yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I happen to be a member of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads; I also happen to be the ranking Republican member of that committee. I signed the card which has been referred to because I had no information from any source, not the slightest intimation, that there would be any serious objection—I withdraw the word "serious" and say any objection to the confirmation of Mr. Hannegan.

I desire to say that circulating a card to take a poll of the committee is not good practice. I hold that view under the tutelage of the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the minority leader, who has always, so far as I know, objected to such procedure in other committees on which I have served with him.

Mr. President, I would not have signed that card if I had known that there was any opposition, if I had known that any Senator, especially a Senator from the nominee's own State had made objection.

I am very sorry indeed that the Senator from Missouri did not notify the chairman or even mention the matter to me as the ranking minority member. I certainly would have insisted upon a meeting of the committee and consideration by the committee. I doubt if the Senator from Missouri could get unanimous consent, but if he wants to make a motion to recommit the nomination I certainly shall vote for it.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, the Senate will recall that on the afternoon of May 3, the same day on which the nomination was presented to the Senate, sometime before 10 minutes past 4, which was the hour of the recess the chairman of the committee sought to obtain immediate consideration and confirmation of the nomination. I may say that prior to that time I had already talked with the minority leader, and I think prior to that time I had also talked with the distinguished Senator from Ohio upon this subject. It was under consideration in my mind as to the proper course of conduct for me to pursue.

To my mind, Mr. President, the remark made by the distinguished Senator from Kansas illustrates very clearly the lack of wisdom of the practice of a committee undertaking to act without the holding of a meeting. The very opportunity for the interchange of views, the very opportunity for the interchange of information, does not exist under the

practice by which a piece of paper is circulated around to the individual members. That illustrates the fact, just as in the case of a board of directors of a corporation, in my judgment, that there is, to say the least, very serious doubt as to the validity of the action, so-called, of a committee which is not based upon some formal action in a meeting of the committee.

In fact, the rules of the Senate, I think distinctly contemplate that committees shall act in meetings. I call attention to rule XXV, subdivision 3, found on page 32 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, which prescribes as follows:

That the several Standing Committees of the Senate having a membership of more than three Senators are hereby respectively authorized to fix, each for itself, the number of its members who shall constitute a quorum thereof for the transaction of such business as may be considered by said committee.

With a certain limitation upon the number which may constitute a quorum.

I note in Webster's Unabridged Dictionary the definition of "quorum" to be as follows.

Such a number of the officers or members of any body as is—

And I call attention to these next words—

when duly assembled, legally competent to transact business.

So, Mr. President, not in any spirit of hostility, not in any spirit of denial of the fine courtesy which has been constantly extended to me by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, for whom I have the highest regard, but from the standpoint of what I believe to be good and proper practice, I call to the attention of the Senate the fact, as I have indicated, that there was no meeting of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads on this important matter. Indeed—and I trust the chairman of the committee will take no offense at my mentioning the fact—I have been in Washington as a Member of the Senate since the 10th day of January of this year, and there has been no meeting of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to my knowledge, certainly none of which I have been informed, on or since the 10th day of January 1945.

The point I make at the outset, as I have said, is that among the reasons why there should be a recommitment of the nomination to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads is the fact that the nomination has not been presented at a meeting of the committee.

It is to be noted also, Mr. President, that there is no urgency which would prevent action in normal and proper course, legal course, if you please, by the committee. There is no urgency which would prevent the holding of hearings, because the appointment, as I observe from the document of which I have a copy, the paper signed by 11 out of 19 members of the committee, distinctly states that the effective date of the appointment of Mr. Hannegan is July 1, 1945, approximately 8 weeks from the present time. So there is no urgency which would have required us, on the

3d day of May, to pass upon this nomination without prior meeting of the committee, or which would require us to pass on it today. This point I mention as to the failure of the committee to meet is presented for the consideration of the Senate.

There is a second reason which to my mind is persuasive and highly important as to the advisability of holding a hearing, or series of hearings, upon the nomination. As I have mentioned, this is a Cabinet office, the office of an adviser to the President of the United States, an officer who has under his jurisdiction vast interests, both of persons and of property. I have been unable to secure a printed copy of the report of the Postmaster General for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, but I observe from the report which the Department has very kindly furnished me for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, that the postal operating revenues for that year were \$966,227,288, almost a billion dollars, under the jurisdiction of the Department over which the Postmaster General presides.

I observe also in the same report the statement that the number of employees of the Post Office Department of the United States is some three hundred and fifty thousand. I quote this significant and interesting sentence from the report:

The Post Office Department is one of the largest employers of men and women in the country, and in peacetime is the largest in the Government.

Not only, however, is there an extensive personnel under the jurisdiction of the Postmaster General; not only is there a tremendous volume of business, as I have indicated but, in addition, there are important contracts all over the United States of America which may readily and properly be considered as apt to be made by the Postmaster General. For illustration, in normal times there comes under this Department the question of the construction of buildings for post offices. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, the Department operated 3,258 Government-owned buildings; and I know that in the State of Missouri—and my distinguished colleague will concur with me, I am sure—there are a great many very fine post office buildings, of which we are very proud; and from time to time there will be others constructed, in normal times, within our State, and in every other State in the Union.

There is another fact, Mr. President, which, as I see it, enters most strongly into the question as to whether or not the filling of this Cabinet office with the proper person is itself of highest importance. I refer to the fact that civil service is to be applied, and under the law of the United States is required to be applied, to the Post Office Department. On the first day of January of this year there were 42,031 post offices in the United States of America, and, as I have previously indicated, back in the fiscal year 1943 the number of employees was some three hundred and fifty thousand. The great bulk of these, I should judge, are clearly under civil service, and this in itself makes it of high importance as to who it is, and what his

attitude may be, who shall fill the office of Postmaster General of the United States.

The third of the reasons why there should be a recommitment of this nomination to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads is the fact that the Postmaster General is generally regarded, and I think correctly so, as exerting much influence, not only with respect to the appointment of those under his own jurisdiction, one-third of a million men and women, but, furthermore, as exerting much influence in the entire field of Federal patronage.

I quote from the Washington Star of May 4 of this year:

It is also a fact, however, that the Cabinet place—

Speaking of the Postmaster Generalship—

by reason of the patronage that goes with it, adds materially to the national chairman.

I shall make mention of the chairman proposition a little further in my remarks.

So we have three reasons, up to this point, as to why there should be a recommitment, first, the fact that the nomination has never been presented to the committee; second, that there is a high degree of importance in filling this Cabinet office with a proper person; and third, the fact that the Postmaster General is generally recognized as exerting much influence in the entire field of Federal patronage.

Mr. President, the fourth reason, as I see it, why the nomination should be recommitment to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads is the decision which Mr. Hannegan is reported to have made to retain his post as chairman of the Democratic National Committee while occupying the office of Postmaster General. I again quote from the Washington Star of May 4:

When Postmaster General Walker—

Who is now in office, I may say—

When Postmaster General Walker resigned as party chairman last year he gave as a reason the fact that, with the war and the constantly growing volume of Post Office business, the latter position had become so important as to require—

And I quote him, as I understand it—the full attention and energy of the Postmaster General.

It is interesting to note in this connection the comments made in the Washington Post of May 5, as follows:

The position of Postmaster General should be regarded as a full-time job. We fail to see how the duties of that office can be successfully discharged by an incumbent who is concurrently serving as chairman of the Democratic Party.

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, this body is entitled to know how, and just how, Mr. Hannegan expects to find time to carry on both positions if Mr. Walker could not do so.

I have advanced four reasons, and I now come to the fifth, which to my mind is likewise of high importance as indicating the desirability and importance of a recommitment of the nomination to the committee. The fifth reason is the

fact that the duties of Postmaster General and those of the chairman of the National Democratic Committee are inconsistent. I quote again from the Washington Post of May 5, as follows:

Such dual responsibilities also require an officeholder to follow incompatible objectives. For the first duty of a Cabinet officer heading a great Government department should be to raise standards of performance and protect his organization against encroachment of the spoils system.

I continue reading from the Washington Post:

The head of the party organization, on the other hand, is virtually compelled to exploit such opportunities as are open to him to parcel out political offices as the spoils of partisan victories.

So I say, Mr. President, in addition to the reasons previously mentioned why there should be hearings before the committee, is the incompatibility and inconsistency of the duties of Postmaster General and those of the chairman of the National Democratic Committee.

Then, Mr. President, there is a sixth reason which to my mind is one of tremendous importance, and it is one which to my mind is of such nature and extent as to require a knowledge of the facts which can only be secured by the Senate or by a committee of the Senate by hearings, and quite extensive hearings, too, upon the subject.

The sixth reason is a series of incidents which occurred in the State of Missouri during Mr. Hannegan's career, which incidents should be examined into by the committee with the purpose of determining whether or not they indicate that Mr. Hannegan is a proper person for the Postmaster Generalship. To my mind the six reasons which I have mentioned are unanswerable respecting the advisability and the importance and reasonableness of the request for unanimous consent from every Member of the Senate for a recommitment of this important nomination.

I have referred to the sixth reason, which involves a series of incidents. I shall take the liberty, Mr. President, of starting right at the birth of Mr. Hannegan. I shall endeavor to be as little tedious as is possible, yet I am sure the Members of the Senate will bear with me when they realize the vast scope of the series of incidents to which I refer.

Robert E. Hannegan was born in the city of St. Louis, Mo., in 1903. He attended St. Louis University and was an honor graduate of its law school in 1925. He was admitted to the bar of Missouri and entered the practice of his profession in St. Louis. He was active in local ward political affairs sometime prior to 1934.

In the spring of 1933, Bernard F. Dickmann, whose name will be mentioned several times, was elected mayor of the city of St. Louis. He was a member of the same political party to which Mr. Hannegan belongs, the Democratic Party. He was a close friend and a political associate of Mr. Hannegan.

On the 12th day of June 1934, in order to fill a vacancy then existing upon the city committee of the Democratic Party for the twenty-first ward, Mr. Hannegan was appointed by Gov. Guy B. Park, of

Missouri, as Democratic ward committeeman for that ward. On August 22, 1934, he was named by the St. Louis Democratic city committee as chairman of that committee.

It is to be noted that in those days factional strife was developing in the Democratic Party in the city of St. Louis; and on May 31, 1935, Mayor Dickmann, in an effort to strengthen Mr. Hannegan, had the board of estimates tell all applicants for city jobs to "See Hannegan first."

Five days later, June 4, Mr. Hannegan was ousted as chairman, being succeeded by one John P. English. Mr. Hannegan retained, however, his high place in the counsel of the Dickmann administration, and participated in a meeting of the Dickmann so-called cabinet, which confirmed the dismissal of hundreds of city employees who had been recommended by committeemen and committeewomen, who had opposed Messrs. Hannegan and Dickmann.

There was pending at that time in the city of St. Louis a very important city administration measure. That was the proposition of the so-called river-front improvements bond issue, sometimes called the Jefferson memorial, relating to the beautification and improvement of a great expanse of river front on the Missouri River, the tearing down of great numbers of buildings, leaving intact the beautiful cathedral, old in point of history and in point of interest. It was a very important matter for that administration.

The administration of Mayor Dickmann was very anxious to procure the two-thirds vote requisite at the election to authorize the bond issue of seven and one-half million dollars.

On the 7th day of September 1935 Mayor Dickmann, speaking before 4,200 city employees, said he expected them to get out a vote favorable to the river-front improvement bond issue of seven and a half million dollars. He stated:

We will know who is working and who is shirking. There is going to be a check-up on Wednesday.

Which was the day following election.

And I don't mean maybe. No matter who may have recommended any city employee for appointment, if he is not loyal he will be got rid of. I am tired of pussyfooting and backbiting. Only those willing to pull in harness are wanted in this administration.

Three days later, September 10, 1935, occurred the election by which the seven and one-half million dollar bond issue above-mentioned, which, as I have indicated, had been actively sponsored by the Dickmann administration, carried by a vote of 123,299 to 50,713.

The next day there occurred at the city hall a riot in which four persons were slightly injured by bullets, and the coat of Mr. English, whom I have mentioned, was pierced by a bullet.

I now come to July 23, 1936. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch of that date presented first accounts of registration frauds. I call attention to the date, July 22, because it was only 12 days, I believe, before the approaching primary election. The Post-Dispatch presented first accounts of registration frauds, and

for 6 days made additional disclosures, during which period the board of election commissioners failed to take action to remove illegal names from election lists, though on August 4 a primary election was to occur.

About July 28, 7 days before the election, the board of election commissioners decided to recheck the entire registration, which recheck disclosed, before the primary election which was to occur on August 4, 1936, that there were 46,252 names on the registration lists which were "not found," amounting to approximately 11.7 percent of the total registration of the city of St. Louis, or about one out of nine names.

On August 4, 1936, there occurred the primary election. On that day, in the election, Mr. Hannegan was again elected to the Democratic city committee. The Post-Dispatch rechecked after the primary, and found that of some 38,794 persons included in the 46,252 "not found," only 2,648 appeared and requested ballots, and that all of that number except 287 were permitted to vote.

On August 16 or 18, 1936, Mr. Hannegan was again chosen Democratic city chairman. Forty-seven of the fifty-six persons elected on August 4 were Dickmann candidates for the city committee.

I have referred to the river-front improvement bond-issue election of September 10, 1935. The relevancy and importance of that will appear in a moment. On the 8th of September 1936 the Post-Dispatch charged the existence of extensive frauds in the river-front improvement bond-issue election of September 10, 1935, and carried a headline reading "Widespread fraud found in Jefferson memorial bond-issue election."

The frauds asserted to exist were of various types. I shall not take the time to detail them, except to mention a very few illustrative incidents. In two precincts no negative votes were reported by the election officials. In two precincts there were more votes cast, according to the returns, than there were persons registered in those precincts. In one case ballot-box stuffing was admitted by two election officials. Forged signatures were discovered on registration books. Affidavits in all the 19 wards which voted above the necessary two-thirds majority disclosed that the affiants cast more negative votes than there were officially counted. In four precincts of Mr. Hannegan's ward there were shown only 52 negative votes on the official returns, whereas affiants appeared with affidavits indicating that 270 persons had voted in the negative, and 51 other persons who did not make affidavit asserted that they also had voted in the negative. Thus a total of 321, 270 of whom are supported by affidavit, asserted that they had voted in the negative in these four precincts of Mr. Hannegan's ward, although the official returns showed but 52 negative votes.

The Post-Dispatch, in the issue of September 18, 1937, in which it recounted certain history of the period which I have discussed said, referring to the river-front improvement bond issue:

The successful outcome of this election was one of the major goals of Mayor Dickmann's first administration. He spoke re-

peatedly in favor of the issue, and personally urged all city employees to vote for the bond issue and aid in putting it over.

I quote further:

Investigation of the election by the Post-Dispatch showed that in each of the 18 wards returned as giving a vote of more than the necessary two-thirds for the bond issue, and in one other ward, fraudulent returns were made, and "no" votes were not counted as cast.

With this situation existing in the city of St. Louis, a widespread demand arose in that city for the removal of the board of election commissioners. We will find in a moment the attitude which Mr. Hannegan, who had now been restored to the position of the chairman of the Democratic city committee, took upon this widespread demand. We find that on or before September 18, 1936, Mr. Hannegan urged upon Governor Park that the existing members of the board of election commissioners be retained. In the Post-Dispatch of September 18, 1937, the following statement appears:

Telling the frantic efforts of politicians to retain the board, for the good of the Democratic Party, in the face of widespread demands for its removal after exposure of gross election frauds, Governor Park said that one of those who urged its retention was Robert E. Hannegan, chairman of the Democratic city committee and the city's lobbyist at the 1935 session of the legislature.

I should say parenthetically that Governor Park was no longer Governor when he made this statement.

I continue to quote from the statement of Governor Park:

"Hannegan based his appeal on practical politics," the former governor said, "without discussing the merits of the case. He urged me not to fire the board. He said it would be bad for the party and that it would come at a peculiarly inopportune time just before the November election. But I told him the board would have to go."

On September 18, 1936, Governor Park removed the board by telegraph. On the same day the Governor issued a statement from which I quote the following:

In no instances has it been shown that any irregularities in connection with the primary election or with the registration were with the knowledge or consent of any of the election commissioners. A prompt and vigorous investigation by the office of the distinguished circuit attorney of the city of St. Louis, a man with irreproachable public record, and by a grand jury of St. Louis citizens has shown it to be a fact that such violations of the election laws or such irregularities as may have occurred were by appointees of the commission or by individuals over whom it had no control. However, it appears that the commissioners were not diligent in supervising the acts of their appointees, and for this reason I am removing them from office.

Mr. Hannegan continued as chairman of the Democratic city committee from and after his election, which had occurred on either August 16 or 18, 1936, until the 10th day of February, 1942. In the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 9, 1942—remember the date, March 9, 1942, because it was shortly after the date on which Senators Truman and Clark had announced their advocacy of Mr. Hannegan for appointment as Collector of Internal Revenue in the city

of St. Louis—there appeared an article on this subject. Under a headline extending clear across the page of the editorial section of the Post-Dispatch is the following:

Ex-Boss Hannegan, who conspired to "steal" the governorship, now is to be rewarded by the President with a \$7,000-a-year job.

In an article published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on March 9, 1942, Mr. Curtis A. Betts, whose name appears as its author, who is the State political correspondent of the Post-Dispatch, and who is widely known throughout the State of Missouri by legislators and the general public, said this:

The political history of St. Louis was a sorry one during the 8 years of the Dickmann-Hannegan machine rule. Immediately after Dickmann's first election in 1933, there developed a step-by-step progress toward the building of a machine to rival that of Boss Tom Pendergast of Kansas City, whose debauchery of the ballot and of public officials led to his downfall and his incarceration in the penitentiary.

Even before the colossal blunder of the attempted governorship steal, the public had begun to grow restless under the threat of a machine designed to be more powerful even than Pendergast's. It had seen the machine under Hannegan's chairmanship invade the sanctity of the judiciary, it had seen the machine knife good candidates and place its tools on the Circuit bench. It had known of the heavy padding of election registration lists.

But it was not until the machine's effort in 1940 to place in the Governor's office Lawrence McDaniel, the Dickmann-Hannegan candidate, through a sordid use of political might—the Democratic control of the legislature—that it so far overstepped the bounds of even political decency as to bring down upon it the overwhelming wrath of the voters.

In a few moments I shall have something to say about that wrath.

Early in the campaign for the Democratic nomination for Governor of Missouri in 1940, Senator Allen McReynolds, of Carthage, a man of high standing in Missouri, a well-known lawyer and public figure who served with distinction in the State senate, and as a member of the recent State constitutional convention, invited the support of Messrs. Dickmann, Hannegan, and the citizens of St. Louis on the basis of a fair and impartial discharge of the duties of the office of Governor. On April 13, 1940, Senator McReynolds issued a statement in the course of which he told of what happened following his invitation for their support. Said the Senator:

I was informed by Mayor Dickmann and Mr. Hannegan that they had been unable to obtain the kind of recognition and appointments they desired from the Governor's office in Missouri and in order to cure this situation they would have their own candidate for Governor in the person of Larry McDaniel.

At the primary election of August 1940, Mr. McDaniel was nominated for Governor on the Democratic ticket, and I was nominated on the Republican ticket.

On August 6, 1940, Mr. Hannegan was reelected as committeeman, and on August 20, 1940, he was reelected as chairman of the committee.

That which the Post-Dispatch refers to in the headline as the "Attempt to steal the governorship," to which reference is made in the article from which I have quoted, is one of the outstanding incidents of Missouri history.

I notice that a day or so ago a reference appeared in a Washington, D. C., newspaper to the effect that a political or election dispute in Missouri would possibly be brought before the Senate. I wish to say it is not to be characterized as a political dispute. As I have indicated, it is one of the most important and outstanding incidents in Missouri history, and I venture to say that not a Member of the Senate who is informed about the matter will undertake for an instant to deny the correctness of my statement.

In the issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 12, 1941, the following appeared:

The scheme of the Democratic State committee—

By the way, let me say that I have never heard anyone charge that the Post-Dispatch is a Republican newspaper. It is, I understand, an independent newspaper. I think many people feel that it has inclinations toward the Democratic side. It has supported Mr. Roosevelt. It has criticized him at times. But I have yet to hear anyone ever say that either the St. Louis Post-Dispatch or the St. Louis Star-Times was or is a Republican newspaper.

Here is what the Post-Dispatch said on January 12, 1941, right in the midst of this so-called governorship steal:

The scheme of the Democratic State Committee to deprive Governor-elect FORREST C. DONNELLY, Republican, of office by means of a partisan legislative investigation of his election and to seat his Democratic opponent, Lawrence McDaniel—

Please listen to this—

has presented probably the most important political problem which has ever arisen in the State.

The legislature's decision early today in support of the scheme establishes a precedent of momentous effect. Never before has an attempt been made to keep out of office the candidate for Governor elected on the face of the official election returns.

The issue is whether a politically constituted legislature may, on the basis of a partisan committee's report of frauds and irregularities in the conduct of an election and without recounting all of the ballots, give the governorship to the candidate shown by the returns to have been defeated.

The basic fact in the governorship situation pending in the legislature is that the Democratic legislature, under pressure from the Democratic State committee, is planning to seat the Democratic candidate for Governor without a full recount of the ballots, notwithstanding the fact that the official election returns showed the Republican candidate elected by a plurality of 3,613.

The election had occurred on November 5, 1940, and the Republican candidate was, according to the official returns, elected by a plurality of 3,613. That was on November 5, 1940. Eight days later there occurred a meeting or gathering of some kind at the DeSoto Hotel, in St. Louis. Mayor Dickmann is

quoted in an article in the Post-Dispatch of January 29, 1941, as follows:

Hannegan called the meeting, as I remember it.

Mr. Hannegan had this to say about it, in the Post-Dispatch of January 30:

I had returned from Hot Springs, Ark., the day prior to the meeting, and learned that Senator Clark and other Democratic leaders were coming to St. Louis, and I decided to have a number of Democrats at a general meeting.

Then there is some other language or reference, which I omit reading, and then appears the following:

No particular Democrats were invited to this gathering or excluded from it. Various Democrats came and left, and during the afternoon I would say that possibly as many as 20 or 25 persons visited the room.

What was the purpose of this meeting? Mayor Dickmann said, as appears in the Post-Dispatch of January 29:

The meeting was to see what steps, if any, should be taken about the governorship.

What was done? Mr. Hannegan said, according to the January 29 issue of the Post-Dispatch:

There were conferences at various times and places—

Please observe carefully that this is his statement published on January 29. The Senate will observe in a moment a further statement which he made on the 30th. This is the statement on the 29th, the day of the issue of the Post-Dispatch in which Mayor Dickmann is quoted as saying:

The meeting was to see what steps, if any, should be taken about the governorship.

Mr. Hannegan said—I quote from the Post-Dispatch:

There were conferences at various times and places and there may have been a meeting at the DeSoto Hotel, at which Hulen decided to make an inquiry as to whether there had been irregularities in the balloting. All further activity and all decisions as to the form of the inquiry were taken by Hulen and his committee without conference with the St. Louis group.

Mr. Hulen, to whom reference was made, was Mr. C. Marion Hulen, of Moberly, Mo., the then chairman of the Democratic State Committee of Missouri.

On January 30, 1941, the Post-Dispatch further quoted Mr. Hannegan as follows:

At the gathering politics was discussed generally, and in discussing the election just passed all seemed to feel that any investigation was a State committee matter and should be determined and handled by Mr. Hulen and the State committee.

It will be recalled that Mr. Hannegan had stated that he had learned that Senator Clark and other Democratic leaders were coming to St. Louis, and that he had decided to have a number of Democrats at a general meeting. But Senator Clark and Mr. Hulen, according to the Post-Dispatch of January 30, did not reach the hotel until approximately 6:30 p. m. Mr. Clark, to whom reference is made, was Senator Clark, a former Member of this body.

I read from the Post-Dispatch:

The meeting was just a gabfest. I had been in the country and came in late, and nothing was decided while I was there; but it seemed the consensus that there should be an investigation by the State committee. The official vote had not then been tabulated, and everyone thought someone should start collecting evidence. There was no decision at the meeting to contest the election, and I never attended any subsequent meeting at which procedure for a contest was discussed.

Mayor Dickmann said:

We all discussed the situation generally, but nothing was decided while I was there. I was the first to leave.

Charles M. Hay, who was there, said:

It was decided that Marion Hulen would make an inquiry to see if he could gather evidence of fraud. Everyone concurred in the decision that this inquiry should be undertaken. * * * Hulen said emphatically during the conference that he and the State committee would not proceed unless they found convincing evidence. We did not discuss the question of procedure in the event such evidence was found. The matter of seating DONNELL, or the form of any possible contest, was never mentioned. That was handled by Mr. Hulen and the State committee, without seeking my advice.

Attorney General Roy McKittrick was present, and stated to a reporter the following:

I said to Hannegan in particular, "One thing you fellows in St. Louis should consider carefully. If you go into this, you will be the ones who are under the gun. You have a city election in the spring, while we country boys have 2 years to get over it before we have an election." Charlie Hay said something to the same effect.

I may say to the Senate that at approximately 6 o'clock in the evening of May 3 of this year, Mr. Hannegan telephoned me. He declared in the course of a very extended conversation that General McKittrick made no such statement as that credited to him. It is obvious that the statement of General McKittrick is very important.

A plan for an "investigation contest" was developed. Mr. Hulen said on January 29:

I, and I alone, started this. No one else.

Mr. Hulen sent 10 lawyers throughout the State in search of evidence. A State-wide investigation had been in progress under Hulen's direction since the 18th day of November. On the 28th of November Hulen conferred in St. Louis with Dickmann, Hannegan, and others relative to the possibility of contesting the election of Governor. The Globe-Democrat of November 29, 1940, stated:

Hulen stated he will know about the middle of next week the degree of truth in reports of alleged fraud, irregularities, and errors.

On December 30, 1940, the Democratic State committee at Jefferson City, Mo., approved a petition to be presented to the legislature asking the leadership to conduct "a general and sweeping investigation into the vote cast for Governor."

Mr. Hulen, however, did not reveal even to the members of the committee, the detailed evidence which he said had been

gathered by investigators under his direction. Mr. Hulen said:

The State committee—

I invite the attention of Senators to this because it is very important—

proceeded on the assumption that the assembly has authority to conduct an investigation before it issues a gubernatorial certificate of election.

The difference between an investigation, so-called, and a contest, is that an investigation would occur before the seating of the person elected on the face of the returns, and during it the person shown by the returns to be elected would not be seated.

That was the plan determined upon, and Senators will now see what the Supreme Court of Missouri said about a contest. According to the Missouri Supreme Court, under the constitution and laws of Missouri, a contest is a proceeding under which the person elected on the face of the returns would be seated, after which a contest would be filed and determined by the joint assembly of the house and senate.

On January 3, 1941, in St. Louis, Chairman Hannegan told the St. Louis Democratic City Committee that he had a letter from Hulen asking the committee to endorse the plan. On that day, January 3, by a unanimous oral vote the committee passed the resolution it had been asked to adopt. I quote from the Post-Dispatch of March 21, 1941:

Thereafter, Chairman Hannegan was a frequent visitor in Jefferson City. He spent time in the offices occupied by St. Louis representatives and senators, in the legislative halls, and the capitol corridors. His presence was remarked on by out-State legislators.

On the nights of January 7 and 8 a caucus was held of the Democratic members of the house of representatives. The issue before the caucus was whether the procedure to be followed would be that of an investigation under which the Governor-elect on the basis of the returns, would not be seated pending the outcome of the investigation, or that of a contest under which he would be seated, followed by the contest itself. Following presentation by Hulen, 75 of those present in the caucus voted for the investigation and only 7 voted against it. The entire St. Louis delegation voted for the so-called investigation. On the morning or during the day of January 8—I do not know what time—Gov. Lloyd C. Stark, Democrat, said:

I do not care to make any statement, because, as Governor, I feel that I should hold myself aloof in this matter. However, all the able constitutional lawyers I have talked to agree that the duly elected Governor should be seated as required by the constitution, and the contest, if any, then be carried out according to the constitution.

The legislature convened on that same day. I quote from headlines of the Post-Dispatch of January 8, 1941:

Increasing opposition to Democratic Committee's scheme to keep DONNELL (Republican) out of Governor's office. No objection to contest in legal form but lawyers say proposed move is steal.

Governor Stark and Senator McReynolds, Democrats, join Republicans and Independents in contention that speaker of house must declare DONNELL elected. After this, if right to office is challenged, ballot boxes must be opened and votes counted.

The Star-Times of January 14 referred to the fact that on or about the 9th or 10th, Attorney General McKittrick informed the Senators that the ballot boxes would not be opened through purely a legislative investigation and accordingly the so-called contest was filed in the name of James T. Blair, Jr.

Then there was held a joint session of the two bodies of the legislature, which began shortly after 4 p. m., January 10, and lasted until nearly 5 o'clock in the morning of January 11. That session will never be forgotten by anyone who participated in it. The joint assembly adopted joint resolution No. 3, the provisions of which, in substance, were as follows:

First, it constituted a committee of 10 persons, 6 of them Democrats and 4 of them Republicans, empowered—notice the word "empowered"; we will come to that in a moment—to recount all the ballots cast for Governor, to conduct a general investigation; to require the opening of the poll books, tally sheets, and ballot boxes in any of the precincts and counties; the recount to be attended by an equal number of Democrats and Republicans.

The members of the committee, however, consisted of six Democrats and four Republicans.

The second thing in the resolution was that pending the investigation and action of the committee no declaration of election should be made by the speaker of the house of representatives with reference to the office of Governor and that no certificate of election should be issued.

The St. Louis Star-Times, under date line of January 11, the same day on which this all-night session concluded, contained an article under a heading reading:

Solid front vote of St. Louis group factor in contest; Hannegan holds party delegation in line during DONNELL test in assembly.

Under that heading appears this statement:

The large Democratic bloc of St. Louis legislators kept in line throughout the week by the day and night efforts of Robert Hannegan, chairman of the Democratic City Committee of St. Louis was a big factor in the battle that ended in defeat for the FORREST C. DONNELL forces early today.

Mr. President, if you had been in Missouri at that time you would have seen arise a storm of resentment from one end of the State to the other, not confined to Republicans, but embracing thousands upon tens of thousands of fine citizens of that State.

A rather remarkable incident occurred on the very day, the 11th of January, on which this action was taken in the middle of the night. A group of St. Louis women came to Jefferson City, and, bearing a small white casket, filed into the rotunda of the capitol in what they termed a "funeral service for the State constitution."

I call attention now to the empowering provisions. The resolution empowered the committee to make an investigation of all the precincts; it empowered them to recount all the ballots. The Star-Times—and if there is anyone in the Senate Chamber or within the hearing of my voice or anywhere in the United States who will say that the Star-Times is a Republican newspaper, I should like to hear him here and now or at any other time—the Star-Times uncovered a joker in this particular resolution. I quote from the Star-Times:

While the committee has the authority to open all the ballot boxes, its authorization contains a "joker" in that it may make a recount only in those precincts which the committee "may deem necessary"—

A committee not composed of an equal number, but a committee of a partisan group, six Democrats and four Republicans.

Then I desire to call attention to an editorial which appeared in the Star Times on the 11th of January, as I recall, or about that time—and I am quite sure it was the 11th—under the headline "The despoilers":

C. M. Hulen, chairman of the Democratic State committee.

Robert E. Hannegan, chairman of the St. Louis Democratic committee.

James T. Blair, Jr., chairman of the Cole County Democratic committee.

Roy McKittrick, Democrat, attorney general of the State.

Morris E. Osburn, Democrat, speaker of the house of representatives.

Democratic senators and representatives, with a few honorable exceptions, members of the sixty-first general assembly.

Look them over! These are the politicians who play leading parts in the plot to deny an election certificate to FORREST C. DONNELL, Republican, chosen Governor of the State on the basis of official returns.

These are the political schemers guilty of a most shameful perversion of power for partisan purposes this State has known since it entered the Union in 1820.

Hulen filed the request in behalf of the Democratic State committee, for a "legislative" investigation of the returns.

Hannegan whipped into line the St. Louis legislative delegation (solidly Democratic) to support Hulen's plea. Blair filed a petition for a "contest" when it became evident that not even the overwhelming Democratic majority would support the Hulen-Hannegan strategy unless a "contest," as well as an "investigation" was asked.

McKittrick gave the Democrats a technical legal opinion advising them that their conduct was legal—

By the way we shall see again what the supreme court of the State said about that—

though the constitution nowhere says that a Governor-elect may be kept out of office pending legislative inquiries of any kind.

Osburn, as speaker of the house, complied with the Democratic caucus plans and overruled Republican motions that he declare DONNELL elected.

The Democratic legislators of the rank and file, with only a few dissenters, voted repeatedly to uphold Osburn's rulings and voted, in the end, to bar Governor-elect DONNELL from office until a Democrat-dominated committee should make its "investigation" and conduct the Blair "contest."

Look them over again! These are the men who bear responsibility for denying inauguration to a governor-elect, as shown by of-

ficial returns, for the first time in Missouri's history.

These are the election grabbers, the unscrupulous partisans, against whose ruthlessness the only hope at this time is the State supreme court.

I might mention at this point the State supreme court consisted of seven Democratic judges. I shall come to that in a moment.

The Globe-Democrat of January 14, 4 days after this all-night meeting, referred to the principle of bipartisan supervision of election procedure.

By the way, I think, in fairness, I should say that, while the Globe-Democrat is an independent newspaper, I think it is generally considered—I certainly personally so consider it—as having very strong Republican leanings. Its history is Republican, and, in my judgment, it is properly to be considered an independent newspaper with strong Republican leanings, whereas the Post-Dispatch and the Star-Times are exactly the contrary.

Quoting now from the Globe-Democrat:

In the plans to contest the recent election for Governor of this State that principle—

Referring to the principle of bipartisan supervision of election procedure—that principle is dumped into the ash can by the Democratic majority of the State legislature. It has appointed a partisan committee to conduct the investigation and contest of that election, a committee of six Democrats and four Republicans, and this committee in its first action completely ignores its Republican members, indicating very clearly that they will be permitted to have no actual part in its subsequent proceedings.

There should be a general and vehement demand by the people of Missouri that, since a contest has been decided upon, however unsavory the means of that decision, it should be conducted by a genuinely bipartisan committee; that it should be thorough, fair, complete. Unless the supreme court acts to stop this procedure, only the people can prevent the consummation of a heinous crime against their rights, against the fairness of elections, which is a fundamental principle of democracy.

In the Post-Dispatch of January 15, 1941, the day after the editorial in the Globe-Democrat, appeared this:

Hannegan, who is definitely opposed to the seating of DONNELL pending the investigation, was in Jefferson City while the legislature was deciding to initiate the vote inquiry and to prevent the inauguration. His duty reportedly was to hold the St. Louis delegation in line with the inquiry plan. He was able to do so with the exception of State Senator Michael J. Kinney, who voted against the Democratic machine.

In the Star-Times of about January 11—I cannot make out the exact date in the photostat—"referring to the plan to keep DONNELL out instead of inaugurating him on January 13," the editorial states—and remember, this is the Star-Times, and I repeat for the benefit of those who may not have been present when I started, the Star-Times has never been accused of being Republican—

Never before in the history of the State has a political party attempted this particular version of election thievery. It is a new low, reaching depths of political degradation unplumbed even in Tom Pendergast's heyday.

On January 13 all officers elected on November 5 were inaugurated except the Governor. Several things happened the same day. Senator Searcy, chairman of the investigating committee, said he did not see how it would be possible for the investigating committee to count all the ballots in the State. On the same day, instead of the person who had been elected Governor on the face of the returns being inaugurated, that individual, who happened to be myself, filed in the Supreme Court of Missouri a mandamus suit against the speaker of the house of representatives to compel him to open and publish the election returns for the office of Governor, and to declare elected the person who received the highest number of votes.

Then Mr. Hannegan issued a statement on January 15, in which he—

(a) Denied the charge that certain Democratic leaders are engaged in a deliberate attempt to steal the governorship.

(b) Charged the lavish and extravagant use of money, both in violation of law and common decency.

Meaning by the Republicans.

(c) Asserted that charges of fraud and irregularities came from all sections of the State.

(d) Stated that the results of an investigation conducted by Mr. Hulen "were of such a nature that the State committee voted unanimously to request the legislature to make a thorough investigation to the end that the full facts might be brought to light."

We will see in a few minutes, by the way, what were the results of the investigation.

Now listen to this. This contains a quotation from Mr. Hannegan.

(e) Stated that "It was the opinion of the State chairman"—

That is, Hulen—

"It was the opinion of the State chairman then and now, in which opinion I heartily concur, that this inquiry not only could, but should be made prior to the issuance of a certificate of election to Mr. DONNELL.

(f) Expressed himself as "somewhat surprised that Mr. DONNELL himself desires to be seated as Governor until the charges made are investigated and determined."

(g) Stated, "I heartily join in the request that all the ballots cast for Governor be recounted and that this be done as quickly and economically as possible and in the presence of equal representation from both political parties and then whoever is shown to have received the highest number of legal votes should be seated as governor."

The Post-Dispatch printed this extensive statement, and, by the way, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks the entire article in the Post Dispatch be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY DEMOCRATIC LEADER WOULD ALLAY SUSPICION OF UNFAIRNESS—CIRCUIT CLERK H. SAM PRIEST AND DR. R. EMMET KANE, LEADER OF ANTI-DICKMANN FACTION, URGE SEATING DONNELL

Chairman Robert E. Hannegan of the Democratic city committee today joined the rapidly growing ranks of Democrats who say they favor nothing short of a full recount of ballots in the legislative investigation of the vote for Governor. To allay any suspicion of an unfair inquiry, Hannegan said he strongly favors the counting of ballots even in precincts in which the correctness of the count is unquestioned by either party.

Hannegan's statement today follows the declaration yesterday by Congressman JOHN J. COCHRAN that he favors not only a complete recount of all the ballots cast but also the immediate seating of the Governor-elect, Republican FORREST C. DONNELL.

Today Circuit Clerk H. Sam Priest and Dr. R. Emmet Kane, leaders of the anti-Dickmann faction of the local Democratic Party, joined in COCHRAN's stand. Hannegan is Mayor Dickmann's right-hand man in the administration of the local Democratic machine.

Priest's full statement follows:

"I have been asked for a statement of my position in the controversy over the governorship.

"It is my personal opinion that the best interests of the State of Missouri and the Democratic Party as well call for the counting of all the ballots cast for Governor in the last election, if contest proceedings are to be continued. Such a recount should be under a committee or board on which both parties will have equal representation.

"Since there seems to be no doubt that the official returns as transmitted to the legislature by the secretary of state give Mr. DONNELL a majority of the votes, he should be seated and allowed to act as Governor until such time as a final outcome of the contest may indicate otherwise."

ROLE IN ADOPTING SCHEME

Hannegan, who is definitely opposed to the seating of DONNELL pending the investigation, was in Jefferson City while the legislature was deciding to initiate the vote inquiry and to prevent the inauguration. His duty reportedly was to hold the St. Louis delegation in line with the inquiry plan. He was able to do so with the exception of State Senator Michael J. Kinney, who voted against the Democratic machine.

It was reported behind the scenes in Jefferson City that many of the Democratic leaders who said they were in favor of a full recount of all ballots were secretly opposed to it and planned to stop it when necessary. As finally drafted and passed, the resolution naming the predominantly Democratic investigating committee gave it power to select specific precincts for its vote recount.

Hannegan told the Post-Dispatch he had nothing to do with this resolution and insisted that, while he spoke to the St. Louis delegation, he gave them no instructions. In a formal statement, he denounced as "plain, deliberate falsehoods" the assertions of Republican leaders that "certain Democratic leaders are engaged in a deliberate attempt to steal the governorship."

TEXT OF STATEMENT

His statement follows:

"I want to say in plain, clear language that the charges repeatedly made by Republican leaders and by some of the press that certain Democratic leaders are engaged in a deliberate attempt to steal the governorship are plain, deliberate falsehoods.

"Everyone who took part in the last campaign knew then and knows now that there never was, in the history of this State, such a lavish and extravagant use of money, both in violation of law or common decency. Since the election, the Republican organizations

have admitted spending the unprecedented amount of approximately one-half million dollars and I think the evidence will show that they spent much more than that amount.

"It was not surprising, therefore, that immediately following the election, there came to the Democratic State committee from all sections of the State charges of fraud and irregularities, charges that were too serious to be ignored, particularly so in view of the fact that the published returns showed a difference of only .0019 of 1 percent of the votes cast for Governor.

"The chairman of the Democratic State committee, Marion Hulen, the proud possessor of a reputation for unquestioned honesty and integrity, conducted an extensive investigation and the results of the investigation were of such a nature that the State committee voted unanimously to request the legislature to make a thorough investigation to the end that the full facts might be brought to light.

"CALLS SEATING UNJUST

"It was the opinion of the State chairman then and now, in which opinion I heartily concur, that this inquiry not only could, but should be made prior to the issuance of a certificate of election to Mr. DONNELL. I can see how there might be a difference of opinion as to what the letter of the law provides, but there certainly can be no difference of opinion as to the spirit of the law. To place a man whose right to the governorship is challenged and on trial by members of a legislature in the Governor's chair would be a contravene sense of justice.

"The Republicans claim they want a fair investigation. If that is actually so, how can they demand that while the investigation is pending the vitally interested party should be occupying the powerful position of Governor. These Republican leaders manifestly want to force DONNELL into the governorship whether he has been legally and honestly elected Governor or not. Certainly, if DONNELL should be seated as Governor while such an investigation is pending, every single official act of his would be under a cloud of suspicion. I am somewhat surprised that Mr. DONNELL himself desires to be seated as Governor until the charges made are investigated and determined.

"I heartily join in the request that all of the ballots cast for Governor be recounted and that this be done as quickly and economically as humanly possible and in the presence of equal representation from both political parties and then whoever is shown to have received the highest number of legal votes should be seated as Governor. If it should prove to be the Republican candidate, I will congratulate him and then join in the request that he be seated."

* COCHRAN'S POSITION

In coming out for the seating of DONNELL, Congressman COCHRAN said that "unless the will of the people is carried out, there will be a break-down in our form of government." He said every ballot box should be opened to determine the people's choice and that the investigating committee should be composed equally of Democrats and Republicans. The committee selected is made up of six Democrats and four Republicans.

Priest also said the committee should be balanced between the two parties, and added: "Since there seems to be no doubt that the official returns as transmitted to the legislature by the secretary of state give Mr. DONNELL a majority of the votes, he should be seated and allowed to act as governor until such time as a final outcome of the contest may show otherwise."

DR. KANE'S COMMENT

Dr. Kane, commenting on equal representation in the proposed recount of the ballots, said that regardless of the method used in

that process the final decision would be made ruthlessly by a partisan legislature.

Approving Congressman COCHRAN's statement, Dr. Kane said:

"That COCHRAN is right in holding DONNELL should be now in the Governor's chair there is absolutely no doubt. No word juggling of Chairman Robert E. Hannegan or any other political sleight-of-hand artist will convince any sane person who knows the meaning of simple English words that the constitution of Missouri is being followed by the Democratic majority in our legislature."

PIECE OF BANDITRY

Members of the legislature who voted to deprive DONNELL of office during the investigation are "a disgrace to public life and ought to be driven out of it," he asserted. "It is evident from the piece of banditry certain legislators have taken that the oath of office they took to respect the constitution means nothing to them. As a Democrat I believe they have outrageously disgraced my party."

Dr. Kane suggested that Hannegan's statement criticising lavish use of money in the campaign ought to lead to opening of the books of the Public Employees' Welfare Association, a city hall organization generally supposed to devote much of its members' dues to campaign purposes.

"The machine of which Hannegan is an integral part," Dr. Kane continued, "has at last gone too far in its arrogant disregard of the rights of the people. If my advice means anything to the local Democratic Party, it will clean house, and clean it thoroughly, before April. If it does not, the Democrats will not only see a Republican Governor in Jefferson City, but they will greet a Republican mayor in city hall as well."

SO MUCH SUSPICION

Elaborating on his formal statement, Hannegan told the Post-Dispatch he believed the resolution as introduced was reasonable giving the committee authority to choose questionable precincts for the recount, but that there is so much suspicion that it would be best to go into every box.

"There isn't one member of the legislature whom I asked to vote for anything," he continued. "When the debates over the investigation were in progress in the house, and in the senate, I was in bed listening to them over the radio and reading the Life of Andrew Jackson."

He defended the unequal membership on the committee. "If the investigating group were equally divided," he said, "the Republicans would vote along party lines and we wouldn't get anywhere at all. There would be two reports brought in, and the committee would tie on all votes. They would never agree on how and where they were to start, and how they would proceed."

Asked if a predominantly Democratic committee could not ride roughshod over the Republicans in arriving at vote totals in recounting the ballots, and in throwing out more Republican votes than Democratic ones, Hannegan replied: "Oh, no, they wouldn't dare to do that; they could never return and face their own party members in the legislature. Besides, the press and the public will be able to attend all the committee's hearings, as I understand it."

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the article stated:

Elaborating on his formal statement Hannegan told the Post-Dispatch he believed the resolution as introduced—

That is, Resolution No. 3—

was "reasonable," giving the committee authority to choose questionable precincts for the recount, but there is "so much suspicion" that it would be best to go into every box.

I still quote from this article:

"There isn't one member of the legislature whom I asked to vote for anything," he continued, "when the debates over the investigation were in progress in the House, and in the Senate, I was in bed listening to them over the radio and reading *The Life of Andrew Jackson*.

"He defended the unequal membership of the committee."

This is still reading from the Post article quoting his statement:

"If the investigating group were equally divided," he said, "the Republicans would vote along party lines and we wouldn't get anywhere at all. There would be two reports brought in, and the committee would tie on all votes. They would never agree on how and where they were to start, and how they would proceed.

Asked if a predominantly Democratic committee could not ride roughshod over the Republicans in arriving at vote totals in recounting the ballots and in throwing out more Republican votes than Democratic votes, Hannegan replied, "Oh no, they wouldn't dare to do that—they could never return and face their own party members in the legislature. Besides, the press and the public will be able to attend all the committee hearings, as I understand it."

Then, on the afternoon of the same day, January 15, 2 days after the suit was filed by me against the speaker of the house of representatives to require him to declare me elected, Governor Stark, the Democratic Governor of Missouri, cast a bombshell which startled the State from one end to the other. Although he was a Democrat, he vetoed Joint Resolution No. 3, the one which had authorized the investigation, and in part the grounds of his veto were three. I quote:

First. The resolution as framed is so written as to permit the legislative committee in its discretion to open part or all of the ballot boxes and to conduct a partial or complete investigation.

Second. I cannot approve a resolution which provides for a partisan set-up in this contest. The legislative committee of the general assembly should be bipartisan and have an equal representation of members from both political parties.

Third. I disapprove of the final paragraph in said Joint Resolution No. 3, which provides that no declaration of election be made by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and no certificate of election be issued.

Listen to this. Governor Stark in his veto said:

Leaving out of consideration any discussion of the constitutional problems—

I digress to say again that the Supreme Court takes care of that, as I shall show in a few minutes—

which is now out of my hands, I am of the opinion that the principles of good government and fair play dictate that the candidate receiving the highest number of votes on the returns published by the secretary of state should be seated, and the contest proceed in a legal and proper manner.

Two days later, after this veto, the *Star-Times*, in the issue of January 17, pointed out that Mr. Hulen was hastening to repair the party lines which suffered as a result of Governor Stark's veto. The *Star-Times* says:

Hulen was not alone in his efforts. Robert Hannegan, St. Louis lawyer and chair-

man of the Democratic city committee, took time off to engage in conversation with members of the St. Louis delegation to the legislature at the capitol yesterday.

With the exception of State Senator Michael Kenney, who approves Governor Stark's veto of the resolution for the gubernatorial contest, the St. Louis lines seem to be holding fast, at least that was the opinion of Representative David A. Hess, who was madder than a hornet at the Governor's action.

Then there was something about the extent of this affair in Missouri at that time. It is very difficult to give Senators an idea of the situation, we are so far removed from it, it having occurred 4 years ago.

I call attention to the fact that the Post-Dispatch on January 15 stated:

Donnell dispute makes page 1 in many cities.

And mention is made of New York, Washington, Philadelphia, Detroit, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, New Orleans, Dallas, Louisville, Pittsburgh, News Week, as referring to this matter, some of them on the front pages, it is said.

Then the article continues:

Daily reports of the Missouri situation have been distributed by wire throughout the Nation all week by the Associated Press, the United Press, and the International News Service. The A. P. has averaged about 1,000 words daily.

On January 18, the Post-Dispatch headline from Jefferson City was as follows:

Protests Against Donnell "Inquiry" Flood Legislators' Offices by Wire and Mail from Voters Back Home.

In the body of the article appeared this statement:

The ever-increasing flood of messages comes by telegraph, telephone, and in post-cards and letters. Many, from persons who say they are Democrats, but voted for DONNELL in November, demand that he be permitted to take the office to which he was elected by 3,613 votes on the face of the official returns.

On the 21st, the Post-Dispatch, under a heading—
Stark—

That is Governor Stark—
gets 1,500 messages praising veto, denouncing Donnell inquiry.

This language occurs in the body:

A heaping mass of letters, postal cards, and telegrams condemning the Democratic majority in the legislature for keeping Governor-elect FORREST C. DONNELL out of office and praising hold-over Governor Lloyd C. Stark for his veto of the assembly's joint resolution, was on display in the Governor's office today. * * *

The communications numbered 1,500 or more, and many of them were signed by more than one person, the number of signatures in some cases being as high as 50.

While there may be in the pile some letters criticizing the Governor for his veto examinations of several hundred did not disclose one such.

On the 15th of January the *Star-Times* had a headline:

"Wave of protests by citizens rises over barring DONNELL."

On January 25 on application of myself, the legislative investigating com-

mittee was halted by a preliminary writ of prohibition issued by the Missouri Supreme Court en banc from opening, recanvassing, and recounting the ballots.

On the same day, the 25th, there appeared in the Post-Dispatch an Associated Press wirephoto of one Clark G. Hardiman, secretary of the Jeffersonians, successor of the St. Louis Democrats-for-Willkie Club, with a stack of petitions before him signed by about 14,000 voters, urging the legislature to seat Governor-elect DONNELL.

On January 25 the Post-Dispatch reporter asked various questions of Mayor Dickmann, among other this:

It is true, is it not, mayor, that you are the active head of the Democratic party in St. Louis, and it is true, is it not, that your organization supports the deal to seat McDaniel?

The heading of the article is—

Dodges questions in Post-Dispatch.

And in the body is this:

Modestly, the mayor referred to Robert E. Hannegan, chairman of the democratic city committee, "he's the real head of the party in St. Louis and not the mayor."

On January 26, while all this mass of resentment was flooding the State of Missouri from one end to the other, there occurred a conference at the Coronado Hotel in St. Louis which was attended by Charles M. Hay, Mr. Hannegan, Mr. Hulen, Mr. McDaniel, and two or three figures whose names the Senate has not heard, Mr. Lauf, Mr. Searcy, and Mr. Blair.

On the 28th Mr. Hay gave out a statement in which he told of having, on January 23, made the suggestion to Senator Searcy that it would in his (Mr. Hay's judgment) be wise to seat DONNELL and then proceed with the matter. In his statement he said that the conference of Sunday at the Coronado Hotel was called to discuss this suggestion. He said that after considerable discussion the view prevailed that inasmuch as the prohibition suit had been filed, and in view of the fact that the whole matter of the validity of the proceedings would be determined by the Supreme Court within a few days, nothing should be done to disturb that situation.

Then the Post-Dispatch of January 28 says this:

Chairman Hannegan also was advised of Hay's statement and asked for his comment.

And this is his comment:

"I have already stated where I stand on this whole matter and I see no reason to change that stand," he replied.

Then the newspaper proceeds:

He referred to a statement published by the Post-Dispatch in which he took the position that DONNELL should have no desire to be seated and should not be seated until an investigation should determine who had been elected legally.

And further commenting in the *Star-Times* Hannegan said this:

I have already issued a statement as to my views and those are still my views. I am surprised that Mr. DONNELL is continuing to put obstacles in the way of a speedy disposal of the matter. By obstacles I refer to his suit before the Missouri Supreme Court

and his threat to take the matter to the Federal court or even to the United States Supreme Court. My position was and still is that I think all the ballots should be counted as quickly as is humanly possible, that they should be counted by a committee which gives equal representation to both sides, that both McDaniel and DONNELL should stand aside until the matter is settled, leaving Stark as Governor.

Statements in the newspapers that the organization in St. Louis wants McDaniel seated to gain control of the police and election boards are not true. Mayor Dickmann won his election in 1937 by 55,000 votes with the Charles P. Williams election board in control. I have said that if I were in a position to make recommendations that I would recommend that Gov. Stark's police and election board appointees be retained."

On January 29, the Star-Times, referring to the Coronado Hotel conference of January 26, said:

At this conference Hay repeated his suggestion to seat DONNELL and then proceed with the contest. Hulen immediately made it plain he would not back down on the contest procedure barring DONNELL from office.

Searcy said, "As far as I am concerned, I'll never vote to seat DONNELL."

Lauf chimed in, "I know that the house will never vote to seat DONNELL."

Hannegan then interposed, "Well, it looks like the conference is over."

However, Hay insisted on further discussions but failed to break down opposition to his proposal. He suggested that if his advice were followed, it might serve to "take the heat off" of the St. Louis Democratic organization in the municipal election next spring when Mayor Bernard F. Dickmann will be up for reelection.

But Searcy, Lauf, and other sponsors of the contest asserted their plans had been carried too far to back down now, regardless of the effect on the St. Louis Democrats in the city election.

Hannegan agreed with this view. "Don't worry about the St. Louis situation," he said, "We'll be able to take care of it."

We are approaching the end of this story. On January 29, after referring to the absence of order from Dickmann and Hannegan to the St. Louis legislators to switch their positions, the Post-Dispatch said:

Several of the St. Louis Representatives, having been among the loudest advocates of the plan to place the defeated Lawrence McDaniel in the Governor's office, on the theory that it would not only save the Democrats their jobs but would contribute materially in strengthening the party machine, gave evidence that they were disturbed over the prospect of receiving the orders which would force them to abandon their stand.

But, in the absence of orders, or in the uncertainty of whether they would be issued the St. Louis group held their lines yesterday afternoon in the House Democratic caucus.

Then the Post-Dispatch of the 18th said:

In every legislative step taken in the stop DONNELL campaign, the 19 St. Louis representatives and 5 of the 6 St. Louis senators have voted with the State Democratic machine and on several occasions there have been bitter exchanges in debate between individual St. Louis representatives and opponents of the committee's scheme.

Mr. President, I shall say a few words now with regard to Hulen's evidence. In the Star-Times of January 17, 1941, it was stated that some of the evidence gathered by the investigating staff of 10

lawyers had already been disclosed to representatives and senators in a series of closed meetings.

In the Star-Times of January 30, however, occurred this language:

The smattering of evidence which Hulen presented to the legislators puzzled even the most astute veterans.

In the article of January 30, 1941, it is also stated:

But what Hulen, Moberly attorney and indefatigable party worker, has found in two months of searching for election irregularities remains a deep secret.

Except for a broad outline as to the nature of the supposed irregularities at the polls, the fraud evidence was a secret to the members of the Democratic State committee when on December 30 it met and authorized a contest of the election of FORREST C. DONNELL; it was still a secret when Democratic legislators in house and senate caucuses heard Hulen and decided to go ahead with the plan to keep DONNELL out of office, and it remained a secret when the ill-starred contest committee was created at the historic all-night session of the joint assembly of the legislature January 10.

From a news account in the Post-Dispatch of February 12, 1941, it appeared that Representative Lowry, of Cape Girardeau County, estimated that petitions signed by at least 100,000 voters to protest against the legislature's failure to seat DONNELL, had been presented to the house of representatives.

Then came the decision of the supreme court on February 19. As I have already said, all seven members of the supreme court were democratic judges. The decision is reported under the heading of *Ex. rel. Donnell v. Osburn* (147 S. W. 2, 1065). The entire decision was unanimous.

1. Order the issuance of peremptory writ of mandamus.

2. Decided that the speaker of the house should declare the election of FORREST C. DONNELL.

3. We held official returns to be prima facie evidence of election and good until proven otherwise by contest in *State ex rel. Attorney General v. Vail* (53 Mo. 97).

4. The argument of the speaker, the joint assembly may go behind the face of the returns and exercise judicial powers to determine the legal votes before the winner is declared according to the face of the returns, is obviously untenable.

5. The action of the joint assembly directing the speaker to make no declaration with reference to the office of Governor is contrary to the affirmative duty placed upon him by section 3, and is void. In our Government the origin of all political power is vested in and derived from the people; it is a government of laws, not of men.

Seven days later occurred the inauguration of the Governor, after a delay of 44 days. A legal contest was then instituted on March 4 by Mr. McDaniel, the recount progressed, and on May 21 the contest was dismissed by Mr. McDaniel. In the course of his letter to State Senator Donnelly, who was later Governor of Missouri, he said:

I received information from varied sources that in virtually every precinct of the State a large number of votes had been counted for my opponent to which I was justly entitled, and a large number of additional ballots had not been counted for either of

us to which I was entitled. These reports were "greatly exaggerated."

I confess freely and frankly that the ballot boxes opened in Missouri in the gubernatorial contest to date have convinced me beyond question of doubt that Gov. FORREST C. DONNELL was elected.

In the Star-Times, adjacent to Mr. McDaniel's letter, is a photograph of Mr. Hulen carrying a brief case. Below the picture are these words:

Frequent sight in legislative halls was C. Marion Hulen, above, chairman of the Democratic State Committee, with the brief case [indicated by arrow] that he said contained evidence that would make Lawrence McDaniel Governor. But the evidence never showed up.

The Post-Dispatch article of the 21st of May contained the following statement:

McDaniel's decision had been expected for at least 2 weeks, the recount of ballots having consistently shown gains by DONNELL above the official count as reported by election officials to the secretary of state, which showed that DONNELL had a plurality of 3,613 in the State. A recount of about half the 1,820,000 ballots in the election had increased DONNELL's plurality to about 7,000, and there was nothing to indicate that McDaniel would show any gains in the remainder.

The indications were that final official returns would show DONNELL's plurality to have been nearly 10,000.

This was May 21; but in the meantime something very significant occurred. On April 1, 1941, 5 weeks after the inauguration of a new Governor, and 6 weeks after the decision of the Supreme Court, there occurred a city election in the city of St. Louis, and William Dee Becker, Republican, defeated Bernard Dickmann by a plurality of 35,684, whereas 4 years previously Mr. Dickmann had been elected by a plurality of 48,170. In November 1940, Mr. Roosevelt had carried the city of St. Louis by 65,173 plurality. So we find this reverse in the situation, the Republicans carrying the city by 35,000 in the April election, after all these happenings, whereas 4 years before Dickmann, a Democrat, had carried it by 48,000.

Mr. Hannegan continued as city chairman until February 10, 1942. Then he resigned as city chairman. Early in 1942 Senator Clark and Senator Truman recommended that the President approve Mr. Hannegan as Collector of Internal Revenue.

Then came the edition of the Post-Dispatch of which I spoke, of March 9, 1942, with the headline:

Ex-boss Hannegan, who conspired to "steal" the governorship, now is to be rewarded by the President with a \$7,000-a-year job.

There were long articles, cartoons, pictures, and various statements, showing the "Ghost Voters Club", and quoting Attorney General Roy McKittrick at the DeSoto Hotel meeting on November 13, 1940, when he said:

One thing you fellows in St. Louis should consider carefully. If you go into this, you will be the ones under the gun. You city fellows have a city election in the spring—

They certainly did—
while we country boys will have 2 years to get over it before we have an election.

I shall ask unanimous consent that this entire document be printed in the RECORD later in my remarks.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, does that include the cartoons?

Mr. DONNELL. Not the cartoons. I can describe the cartoons. They show Mr. Hannegan with the label "Hannegan for collector," being pulled out of the governorship steal, and there are various pictures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the matter referred to may be printed as requested.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I wish to call attention very briefly to certain important comments from citizens of St. Louis, under the heading "What St. Louisans think of job for Hannegan."

Herewith are the replies of St. Louisans who were asked by the Post-Dispatch to comment on the Missouri Senators'—

Senators Truman and Clark—

selection of Robert E. Hannegan for Presidential appointment as collector of internal revenue at St. Louis.

Former Governor Henry S. Caulfield, now director of public welfare of St. Louis:

"I agree with your courageous editorial against the appointment of Hannegan. In this dread time when men and women are striving for national unity and for faith that our President is a leader raised by patriotism high above partisan politics, it would be a distinct let down, a grievous shock, for him to make this sordid machine appointment.

"The people's opinion of the Dickmann-Hannegan machine was registered at the last election. To make this appointment would flout the people and array the President on the side against good government. The Post-Dispatch is rendering a valiant service in bringing the truth home to him."

Mrs. George Gellborn, former president of the League of Women Voters:

"The Post-Dispatch editorial on the Hannegan appointment throws the floodlight on a sorry situation long recognized by some of us, the people. 'Find a job for the man,' say Missouri's Senators, following the outdated patronage system. So they nominate Mr. Hannegan for the position of collector of internal revenue. But we the people voted against Mr. Hannegan and patronage last September 16, when we passed the civil-service amendment to the St. Louis charter. The people voted for merit, the people voted to find the man for the job, not the job for the man. Too bad that the merit system in the Federal civil service does not apply to the purely administrative post of collector of internal revenue. Too bad that such posts are dependent on Senate confirmation. Too bad that for reasons we can only surmise Missouri's Senators have found it expedient to nominate Mr. Hannegan. Perhaps they need to hear more from us, the people, who are fighting to preserve democracy on every front, including the home front. Perhaps the President will invite Senators Clark and Truman to withdraw the nomination of Mr. Hannegan, or, better yet, perhaps Mr. Hannegan will withdraw himself."

J. A. McClain, dean of the law school, Washington University:

"Appointments to the position of Internal Revenue Collector, as has been true of other important Federal posts, have traditionally been treated by Democrats and Republicans alike as political plums. Little else can be expected so long as the patronage system remains entrenched in Federal, State, and local Government. The basic fault, as the Post-Dispatch has repeatedly emphasized, lies in our failure to insist that merit and ability to do the job constitutes the sole considera-

tion. This basic handicap is one of the greatest threats to the survival of democracy."

George R. Throop, chancellor of Washington University, which is one of the largest educational institutions in the State, the one of which former Gov. Herbert S. Hadley once was chancellor, is quoted as follows:

I agree completely with statement contained in your telegram regarding appointment of Robert E. Hannegan. (The telegram sent to Dr. Throop contained excerpts from a Post-Dispatch editorial published Sunday. This editorial is reprinted today on the editorial page.)

Dr. R. Emmett Kane—one of the leading Democrats of St. Louis, I think—is quoted as follows:

I am in complete agreement with the efforts of the Post-Dispatch to prevent the appointment of Hannegan to the collector's post. Supporters of good government defeated the political machine which bore his name and which was directed by him. Good government now demands that neither he nor Dickmann be rewarded by lucrative appointive offices after their repudiation by their fellow townsmen.

I may say that Mr. Dickmann is now the postmaster of St. Louis.

I quote further from the article:

Truman and Clark will hang a millstone about the neck of their party in St. Louis if they force this appointment. All of these men should be grateful to the party which has done so much for them. They should not crucify it.

Rabbi F. M. Isserman, Temple Israel, is quoted as follows:

Hannegan's political leadership has been repudiated by the voters of the Democratic Party. To appoint him now to high public office would be to flout public opinion. The collectorship of Internal Revenue should be filled by a man who holds the confidence and respect of the community. It should not be a political plum handed out to repay political favors. When Senators recommend repudiated political leaders for high office they place personal interest above public welfare and their recommendations should be ignored. I hope that President Roosevelt will recognize that the citizens of this area disapprove of Mr. Hannegan's appointment.

Mrs. George Roudebush, president of the League of Women Voters, is quoted as follows:

Wholeheartedly concur in opposing Hannegan's appointment. Now, when Government is extending in many directions, it is more than ever necessary that its functions be administered honestly and efficiently. No man under whose dictatorship a political machine seized and dispensed spoils with utter disregard for community welfare can be considered fit to fill an office for which the prime requisite is honest concern that the public be honestly served. It is deplorable that this type of administrative post remains outside civil service and thus a party plum. If Senators Truman and Clark continue to support Hannegan, they will flout the judgment of thousands of St. Louis voters.

There are three short paragraphs more. One is a quotation of a statement by Mrs. Luella B. Sayman, a former member of the St. Louis Housing Authority:

The pending appointment of a new internal-revenue collector at St. Louis would

seem to furnish definite proof of the importance of including this responsible public office under the Federal merit system in preference to the present patronage method of appointment by favor. The fitness of the individual for the job is unquestionably the all-important point and should be the determining factor in selecting the new appointee, regardless of political services or affiliation.

Mrs. Jerome E. Cook, author of *Boot Hill Doctor* and other novels, is quoted as follows:

Now as never before we, the people, need to have confidence in our officials, above all in their loyalty to public welfare. I believe the Post-Dispatch is correct in declaring that a man whose record the voters have indignantly repudiated should not be rewarded by a valuable appointment. Senators Clark and Truman must be reminded of the indignation of their fellow Missourians. We want a man recommended because of his record, not despite it. To do otherwise is to damage public faith.

Finally, Mrs. Virgil Lewis, a leader in civic affairs and defense activities, and she is so described in the article, is quoted as follows:

St. Louis citizens in the April election clearly demonstrated that they believed in the doctrine of party responsibility. If Senators Clark and Truman fail to recognize what a political liability the appointment of Mr. Hannegan would be to the Democratic Party, they appear to be very unimaginative traders of political commodities. But the public cannot evade its responsibility for such a situation by raging against it or even voting against it at intervals. So long as we retain the antiquated system of requiring the President to appoint hundreds of administrative officials, such as United States marshals, collectors of customs, and collectors of internal revenue, subject to confirmation by the Senate, we turn these jobs over to the spoilsmen.

Mr. President, I have already obtained unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD, and I desire to have it printed including the excerpts from statements made by various citizens.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The article is as follows:)

EX-BOSS HANNEGAN, WHO CONSPIRED TO "STEAL" THE GOVERNORSHIP, NOW IS TO BE REWARDED BY THE PRESIDENT WITH A \$7,000-A-YEAR JOB—APPOINTMENT AS COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE SLATED TO GO TO SENATE FOR CONFIRMATION THIS WEEK—SPONSORED BY BENNETT CLARK, WHO ALSO WAS IN ON THE "DEAL"—ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF THE POLITICAL HAND-OUT AS RESULT OF PRESSURE TO SERVE PARTY AND KEEP MACHINE INTACT—AGAIN THE STORY OF THE GOVERNORSHIP STEAL AND THE IMPORTANT PART HANNEGAN PLAYED IN IT—HOW THE PEOPLE KICKED DICKMANN OUT—HOW THE PRESIDENT IS ABOUT TO PUT HANNEGAN IN

(By Curtis A. Betts)

One of the curious inconsistencies of life in democratic America is the blind and unreasoning loyalty to party which so frequently takes precedence over loyalty to the public interest and, in many instances, loyalty to public decency.

Hoary tradition dictates that the rich political plums shall go to those who have served the party, regardless of any question of service to the public. The politician whom a Senator endorses, a President must appoint and the Senate confirm. Simply because of

that custom, Robert E. Hannegan, retiring chairman of the St. Louis Democratic City Committee and partner in the scuttled Dickmann-Hannegan machine, is about to be rewarded this week with the \$7,000 job of United States Collector of Internal Revenue in St. Louis.

Former Mayor Bernard F. Dickmann, senior partner in the ill-starred venture into the realm of "big time" politics, is in political oblivion, defeated for a third term a year ago by a majority of 35,684, a crushing repudiation by an electorate which 4 years before had chose him for the city's highest office by a majority of 48,170.

The organization headed by Dickmann and his sidekick, Hannegan, was wrecked by political greed and unconscionable grasping for power. It is floundering and helpless. It is unable even to agree upon a new chairman who has the confidence of the party members and is capable of rescuing it from the chaos into which it has been tumbled.

HANNEGAN TOOK THE FIRST OVERT STEP

But Hannegan is to be rewarded for past services. He was an active participant—in deed, he took the first overt step—in the disgraceful attempt to "steal" the governorship for Lawrence McDaniel, a machine cohort. He was loyal to United States Senator Bennett Champ Clark and to United States Senator Harry S. Truman. His organization had been faithful, as politicians view faith, and had delivered votes for them when they needed votes. So, regardless of public protest and public revulsion, the two Senators from Missouri are determined to pay their debt to him.

The political history of St. Louis was a sorry one during the 8 years of the Dickmann-Hannegan machine rule. Immediately after Dickmann's first election in 1933, there developed a step-by-step progress toward the building of a machine to rival that of Boss Tom Pendergast of Kansas City, whose debauchery of the ballot and of public officials led to his downfall and his incarceration in the penitentiary.

Even before the colossal blunder of the attempted governorship steal, the public had begun to grow restless under the threat of a machine designed to be more powerful even than Pendergast's. It had seen the machine under Hannegan's chairmanship invade the sanctity of the judiciary, it had seen the machine knife good candidates and place its tools on the circuit bench. It had known of the heavy padding of election registration lists.

But it was not until the machine's effort in 1940 to place in the Governor's office Lawrence McDaniel, the Dickmann-Hannegan candidate, through a sordid use of political might—the Democratic control of the legislature—that it so far overstepped the bounds of even political decency as to bring down upon it the overwhelming wrath of the voters. The voters defeated Dickmann for reelection by a majority almost as large as that by which they had elected him 4 years before, and by defeating him made certain that Hannegan could no longer head the party organization in St. Louis. They declared as vociferously as they could that they wanted no more of Dickmann, and no more of Hannegan, in position of public authority.

MACHINE LEADERS LOOKING AFTER SELVES

Until its foray into State politics, the machine seemingly had a strangle hold on St. Louis. But it was not satisfied with that. Power breeds a desire for more power, and with the collapse of Pendergast the St. Louis politicians thought they saw the opening for control of Jefferson City and of the State, as well as St. Louis. To get that control, the machine must have its man in the Governor's chair. Studying the list of availables, it decided upon McDaniel, who was Dickmann's appointee as city excise commissioner, and

who seemed to fill the bosses' requirements in every respect.

Dickmann and Senator Clark did not agree on an candidate in the early negotiations. Clark preferring Dan M. Nee, United States Collector of Internal Revenue in Kansas City. But when trial balloons failed to show that Nee had the desired following, Clark withheld the go-ahead sign for Nee, and joined with Dickmann in the support of McDaniel.

McDaniel's candidacy proved a dud. Although President Roosevelt carried the State by 87,467, so great was the machine handicap for McDaniel that he lost to his Republican opponent, FORREST C. DONNELL, by the slim margin of 3,613 on the official return. It was the first time a Republican Governor had been elected in Missouri in 12 years.

This was a devastating blow to the machine leaders. All their plans were wrecked. Loss of the governorship meant they were deprived of the huge patronage of the Governor's office, patronage being a vital necessity for the maintenance of a political machine, and that they were deprived of the many financial favors which flow from a Governor to those who serve the party organization.

In a desperate situation, they decided upon a desperate course. In the forlorn hope of saving themselves, they wrecked their party organization in city and State, and threw out of jobs in St. Louis many thousand loyal followers. The leaders themselves went scurrying to Washington to see what the national administration could do for them. Dickmann landed quickly with the job of Inspector General in the Office of Civilian Defense, but that job recently was abolished, and he is again on the waiting list. Recently McDaniel landed himself a \$3,000 job as parole officer of the St. Louis Circuit Court. Hannegan is to be taken care of with the fat office of Internal Revenue Collector. The chiefs in the machine had ways of looking out for themselves, but the men and women in the ranks are not that fortunate.

In whose mind first lodged the germ which gave birth to the partisan scheme to steal the governorship, to prevent Governor DONNELL from taking office and to install McDaniel in his stead, has been held a closely guarded mystery, but it is known that the first overt step was taken November 13, only 10 days after the State election.

That first overt step was taken by none other than Hannegan. He called a conference of party leaders in a room in the De Soto Hotel for the purpose, as Dickmann later explained it, of "discussing what, if anything, should be done about the governorship." In that smoke-filled hide-out gathered Dickmann and Hannegan, Senator Bennett Clark, Attorney General Roy McKittick, Secretary of State Dwight H. Brown, Chairman Charles M. Hay of the St. Louis Board of Election Commissioners, Probate Judge Glendy B. Arnold, Chairman C. Marion Hulén of the Democratic State committee, State Senator Michael Kinney, of St. Louis, and others.

They discussed the catastrophe which had overtaken the machine and they reached a decision, not unanimously, but by sufficient strength for State Chairman Hulén to proceed with the approval of the machine. Those in attendance never have admitted that this discussion was anything more than an authorization for Hulén to make an investigation to determine whether there was evidence of fraud and election irregularities which would justify the institution of a contest. But the fact is that from that moment the plot to seize control of the Governor's office was in full swing.

COULD NOT SAY THEY HAD NOT BEEN WARNED

When the plot failed, with its consequent repudiation of Dickmann and Hannegan, they could not say that they had not been warned. Sitting in the haze of the curling blue smoke listening and taking little part

in the discussion of plans, was Attorney General McKittick, who is noted for a political sagacity acquired through years of rough and tumble campaigning in his native Chariton County. The course of many a political conference has been changed by one homely comment by McKittick.

As the discussion went more and more into detail, McKittick changed his seat a time or two until he was off in a corner almost by himself. About all that was to be said about the plans had been concluded, Hannegan was summing up, when McKittick interrupted and said:

"One thing you fellows in St. Louis should consider carefully. If you go into this you will be the ones under the gun. You city fellows have a city election in the spring, while we country boys will have 2 years to get over it before we have an election."

The stage was set, however, and McKittick's warning went unheeded. The political mind could easily hold the idea that nothing could go wrong with the plans, so long as the Democrats controlled both branches of the legislature. They would simply have the legislature vote McDaniel in and DONNELL out, and that would be all there would be to it.

And with carrying out of the scheme what had the machine in St. Louis to fear in the spring election? Would it not control both the board of election commissioners and the board of police commissioners? What more would be needed to reelect Mayor Dickmann?

State Chairman Hulén—the front man for the State machine—immediately put into motion the forces necessary, as it was thought, to lay the groundwork for carrying out the plan, and to get the sorely needed support of the entire Democratic organization in the State. Ten lawyers were employed to gather evidence of "Republican frauds," Democratic jobholders in St. Louis, Jefferson City, and throughout the State began to pour in reports. In 6 short weeks Hulén was primed.

At a meeting of the Democratic State Committee in Jefferson City December 30, Hulén solemnly announced he had sufficient evidence to show that McDaniel had been elected and that Republican frauds had resulted in McDaniel being counted out. But he did not produce an iota of his evidence for the committee. He had a bulky brief case, which he said contained the evidence, and he even loosened one strap of the brief case, but he didn't get it opened. The State committee took his word for it and adopted a resolution calling for a general and sweeping investigation of the election.

It also asked that the local Democratic committees throughout the State adopt resolution: to be addressed to the legislature, urging the investigation.

HANNEGAN READY AND EAGER FOR HIS ROLE

Hannegan not only was ready but also eager for his role in St. Louis. As chairman of the Democratic city committee, he called the city committee into session just 4 days later, January 3, 1941, at the Jefferson Hotel. Again no evidence of fraud was presented, but Hannegan explained that the State committee desired the adoption of a resolution which had been prepared in advance. Forty-nine of the 56 members of the city committee were present and unanimously followed Hannegan's advice and adopted the resolution.

The scheme for an investigation, as distinguished from a contest, was a slick political trick. It called for a legislative committee to be controlled by Democrats, which would have the power to hear such evidence as it wanted to hear and exclude such evidence as it didn't want to hear, and to examine only such ballots as it wanted to examine, and to make its report to a Democratic legislature. Its report would be approved or rejected, the machine leaders seemingly having no fear of a rejection.

Of supreme importance in the plot was the fact that it would prevent the inauguration of Governor DONNELL on January 13, the date fixed in the State Constitution.

JUST ONE SLIP IN SCHEMING

There was just one slip in the scheming. The machine did not take into consideration the Missouri Supreme Court, or if it did, was so naive as to think it could count on a solidly Democratic Supreme Court to throw in with it. It was the Supreme Court, acting with high judicial integrity, which caused the collapse of the whole plan.

If there was any honest doubt in the minds of any of the Democratic leaders that Governor DONNELL had been elected, the proper legal course to have followed was for McDaniel to file a contest petition with the legislature, provision for which is made in the Constitution. The Supreme Court so held when DONNELL instituted proceedings to stop the illegal investigation. That, however, was just what the machine did not want. For that would have provided for opening all of the ballot boxes, and DONNELL would have been seated as Governor pending the outcome.

The legislature boldly attempted to play the part cut out for it by the machine. At a stormy all-night session January 11, and over the protest of a few Democratic members, it adopted the investigation resolution. There came an almost instantaneous blast of disapproval from throughout the State.

Leading Democrats, Gov. Lloyd C. Stark, Congressman JOHN J. COCHRAN, State Senator Allen McReynolds, of Carthage, State Senator Michael Kinney, of St. Louis, and others, denounced the scheme as illegal, and insisted that the only legal course would be to follow the Constitution with a straight-out contest, seat the Governor, and proceed in an orderly manner.

FOUR WERE STRANGELY SILENT

Strangely silent were Senator Clark, Senator Truman, Mayor Dickmann, and the city chairman, Hannegan. None had even a suggestion of criticism of the scheme. They were mute, awaiting results.

Four days after the resolution was adopted by the legislature and the aroused fury of Democrats as well as Republicans over the attempted steal had become evident, Hannegan issued a statement advocating the counting of all ballots but persisting in demanding a partisan inquiry and decision.

Governor Stark said: "All the able constitutional lawyers I have talked with agree that the duly elected Governor (DONNELL, the Republican) should be seated as required by the constitution, and the contest, if any, then be carried out according to the Constitution."

Congressman COCHRAN said: "Unless the will of the people is carried out there will be a break-down in our form of government."

State Senator McReynolds said: "It is the duty of the majority (the Democrats in the legislature) to observe the exact language of the constitution."

State Senator Kinney said: "We should follow the Governor's advice and proceed in an orderly constitutional way."

Clark, Truman, and Dickmann said nothing. Hannegan continued to stand for a narrow, partisan decision.

Governor Stark on January 15 threw the machine leaders into a state of consternation by the unprecedented action of vetoing the "investigation" resolution passed by the legislature. No governor ever before had exercised the power of veto over a legislative resolution. The machine leaders and the legislative leaders who had been charged with the spade-work of carrying out the machine orders were thunderstruck.

SCHEMERS EDGING AWAY

Governor Stark's veto message terrorized the machine leaders, and they began to edge

away from an appearance of participation in the scheme. They began to itch and squirm, and, looking forward to the city election in St. Louis, in which Dickmann was a candidate for mayor for the third time, they began to seek a way to calm the tumult.

It became common talk in St. Louis and through the State that the governorship contest would mean Mayor Dickmann's defeat. The machine leaders recalled, but alas too late, the words of homely wisdom uttered by Attorney General McKittrick 2 months earlier in the smoke haze of the DeSoto Hotel hideout, "You city fellows have a city election in the spring, while we country boys will have 2 years to get over it before we have an election."

Governor Stark said in his veto message: "Leaving out of account any discussion of the constitutional problem, which is now out of my hands (it had been taken to the Supreme Court by DONNELL), I am of the opinion that the principles of good government and fair play dictate that the candidate (DONNELL, the Republican) receiving the highest number of votes in the returns published by the secretary of state should be seated, and the contest proceed in a legal and proper manner."

CLARK BREAKS SILENCE

Senator Clark in Washington finally broke his silence after the State was aroused to fever heat. The mayoralty election was then only 10 weeks off. He spoke, but vaguely, and in generalities: "I certainly think that under no circumstances should the contest on the governorship be made in a partisan manner. Just because the Democrats have a majority in the legislature is no reason for throwing DONNELL out. On the other hand, if McDaniel was elected, he should be seated. As to the legal aspects of the case, I must decline to give an offhand opinion."

However, State Senator McReynolds, a lawyer of recognized ability, had not hesitated to express the legal opinion that the course being pursued was illegal. Governor Stark, acting on legal advice, had not hesitated to declare it illegal. The supreme court, deciding the case, specifically held that it was illegal.

The wishy-washy statements by the machine leaders and Senator Clark served to increase the public clamor for fairness, but the party leaders held their ground, continuing their plans, if not with the same degree of openness, to carry out the original scheme, but stopped for the time being by the supreme court, to which DONNELL had appealed. The supreme court, in accepting jurisdiction of the case, had directed that all proceedings be held up until its final decision.

By the latter part of January, while the supreme court was considering the issue, the first noticeable evidence that the machine leaders were thoroughly scared of the effect of the contest on Dickmann's chance for reelection appeared in Jefferson City. St. Louis members of the legislature who, with the exception of Senator Kinney from the beginning and Senator Clinton T. Watson later, began to soften in their support and showed signs of abandoning the stand they had taken. One of them said, "To hell with the governorship if this thing's going to beat Barney."

ANOTHER HOTEL MEETING

The real break came late in January when State Senator L. N. Searcy, of Eminence, chairman of the "investigating" committee, was summoned to another hotel conference in St. Louis. It was held at the Coronado Hotel. In addition to Searcy, one or two other members of the legislative committee were there to meet Hannegan and some of his St. Louis machine cohorts. Hannegan by that time had become convinced that the fight was endangering Dickmann and he knew that Dickmann's defeat would mean

the immediate collapse of the machine on which they had so laboriously toiled for 8 years.

At the Coronado Hotel conference, Hannegan sought to abandon the governorship steal, advising Searcy that nothing more should be done to carry out the detailed plans of the original cabal, that the "investigation" should be halted, that Governor DONNELL should be seated.

But those who had been charged with the legislative responsibility at Jefferson City were in no mood to quit. Whatever their doubts in the beginning, they had gone so far that they were not willing to backtrack. Senator Searcy returned to the capital determined to recklessly brazen it through.

However, he was not given the opportunity. The supreme court decided the matter for him. On February 19 the court ordered that Governor DONNELL be seated, holding that a "contest" under the Constitution was the proper mode of procedure.

The supreme court left the schemers only the toe-hold for starting all over again with a legal contest. Governor DONNELL was inaugurated February 26, and shortly afterward a contest petition was filed by McDaniel with only the half-hearted support of the machine and the legislative leaders most active in the original proceeding. The schemers really had no hope of sustaining a contest, but a recount of the ballots was begun. As the returns came in it was evident that if there had been frauds and irregularities they had been in McDaniel's favor rather than DONNELL'S. The indications soon were that a completed recount would show that DONNELL had been elected by a majority in excess of 10,000, instead of the 3,613 shown by the original returns.

Even in the face of this situation, it was not until May 21 that McDaniel abandoned hope that through some quirk of fate the cards would fall his way, although long before that the originators of the plot had lost interest in it. For Dickmann had been defeated for reelection in the April election. The Republicans had control of the city hall. Nearly all the St. Louis machine Democrats were out of jobs, and there was no rift in the clouds for the Democrats in the contest. So on May 21, McDaniel asked the Legislature to dismiss his contest, which, he said, he had instituted "with the highest motives," and "with the firm conviction that I had in truth and in fact been elected Governor."

So ended the most gigantic attempted political steal in the history of the State. Dickmann and Hannegan became job hunters instead of job dispensers. What its effect will be on Senator CLARK when he seeks reelection 2 years hence is for disclosure in the still somewhat remote future. As for the immediate future, it seems reasonably certain that while the people kicked Dickmann out, the President and the Democratic majority in the United States Senate are about to put Hannegan in.

WHAT ST. LOUISANS THINK OF JOB FOR HANNEGAN

Former Gov. Henry S. Caulfield, now director of public welfare of St. Louis:

"I agree with your courageous editorial against the appointment of Hannegan. In this dread time when men and women are striving for national unity and for faith that our President is a leader raised by patriotism high above partisan politics, it would be a distinct let-down, a grievous shock, for him to make this sordid machine appointment. The people's opinion of the Dickmann-Hannegan machine was registered at the last election. To make this appointment would flout the people and array the President on the side against good government. The Post-Dispatch is rendering a valiant service in bringing the truth home to him."

Mrs. George Gellhorn, former president of the League of Women Voters:

"The Post-Dispatch editorial on the Hannegan appointment throws the floodlight on a sorry situation long recognized by some of us, the people. 'Find a job for the man,' say Missouri's Senators, following the outdated patronage system. So they nominate Mr. Hannegan for the position of collector of internal revenue. But we the people voted against Mr. Hannegan and patronage last September 16, when we passed the civil-service amendment to the St. Louis Charter. The people voted for merit, the people voted to find the man for the job, not the job for the man. Too bad that the merit system in the Federal civil service does not apply to the purely administrative post of collector of internal revenue. Too bad that such posts are dependent on Senate confirmation. Too bad that for reasons we can only surmise Missouri's Senators have found it expedient to nominate Mr. Hannegan. Perhaps they need to hear from us the people, who are fighting to preserve democracy on every front, including the home front. Perhaps the President will invite Senators Clark and Truman to withdraw the nomination of Mr. Hannegan, or, better yet, perhaps Mr. Hannegan will withdraw himself."

J. A. McClain, dean of the Law School, Washington University:

"Appointments to the position of Internal Revenue Collector, as has been true of other important Federal posts, have traditionally been treated by Democrats and Republicans alike as political plums. Little else can be expected so long as the patronage system remains entrenched in Federal, State, and local government. The basic fault, as the Post-Dispatch has repeatedly emphasized, lies in our failure to insist that merit and ability to do the job constitute the sole consideration. This basic handicap is one of the greatest threats to the survival of democracy."

George R. Throop, chancellor of Washington University:

"I agree completely with statement contained in your telegram regarding appointment of Robert E. Hannegan." (The telegram sent to Dr. Throop contained excerpts from a Post-Dispatch editorial published Sunday. This editorial is reprinted today on the editorial page.)

Dr. R. Emmet Kane:

"I am in complete agreement with the efforts of the Post-Dispatch to prevent the appointment of Hannegan to the collector's post. Supporters of good government defeated the political machine which bore his name and which was directed by him. Good government now demands that neither he nor Dickmann be rewarded by lucrative appointive offices after their repudiation by their fellow townsmen. Truman and Clark will hang a millstone about the neck of their party in St. Louis if they force this appointment. All of these men should be grateful to the party which has done so much for them. They should not crucify it."

Rabbi F. M. Isserman, Temple Israel:

"Hannegan's political leadership has been repudiated by the voters of the Democratic Party. To appoint him now to high public office would be to flout public opinion. The collectorship of internal revenue should be filled by a man who holds the confidence and respect of the community. It should not be a political plum handed out to repay political favors. When Senators recommend repudiated political leaders for high office they place personal interest above public welfare and their recommendations should be ignored. I hope that President Roosevelt will recognize that the citizens of this area disapprove of Mr. Hannegan's appointment."

Mrs. George Roubush, president of the League of Women Voters:

"Wholeheartedly concur in opposing Hannegan appointment. Now, when Government is extending in many directions, it is more than ever necessary that its functions be administered honestly and efficiently. No man under whose dictatorship a political machine seized and dispensed spoils with utter disregard for community welfare can be considered fit to fill an office for which the prime requisite is honest concern that the public be honestly served. It is deplorable that this type of administrative post remains outside civil service and thus a party plum. If Senators Truman and Clark continue to support Hannegan, they will flout the judgment of thousands of St. Louis voters."

Mrs. Luella B. Sayman, former member, St. Louis Housing Authority:

"The pending appointment of a new internal revenue collector at St. Louis would seem to furnish definite proof of the importance of including this responsible public office under the Federal merit system in preference to the present patronage method of appointment by favor. The fitness of the individual for the job is unquestionably the all-important point and should be the determining factor in selecting the new appointee, regardless of political services or affiliation."

Fannie Cook (Mrs. Jerome E. Cook), author of *Boot Heel Doctor* and other novels:

"Now as never before we, the people, need to have confidence in our officials, above all in their loyalty to public welfare. I believe the Post-Dispatch is correct in declaring that a man whose record the voters have indignantly repudiated should not be rewarded by a valuable appointment. Senators Clark and Truman must be reminded of the indignation of their fellow Missourians. We want a man recommended because of his record, not despite it. To do otherwise is to damage public faith."

Mrs. Virgil Lewis, a leader in civic affairs and defense activities:

"St. Louis citizens in the April election clearly demonstrated that they believed in the doctrine of party responsibility. If Senators Clark and Truman fail to recognize what a political liability the appointment of Mr. Hannegan would be to the Democratic Party, they appear to be very unimaginative traders of political commodities. But the public cannot evade its responsibility for such a situation by raging against it or even voting against it at intervals. So long as we retain the antiquated system of requiring the President to appoint hundreds of administrative officials, such as United States marshals, collectors of customs and collectors of internal revenue, subject to confirmation by the Senate, we turn these jobs over to the spoilsmen."

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, in reference to the fact that the appointment of Mr. Hannegan was suggested by Messrs. Clark and Truman, who announced their support of Mr. Hannegan in the early part of 1942, I desire to quote from the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 88, part 8, at page A1147, at which appear the remarks of Mr. WALTER C. FLOESER, a Member of the House of Representatives, who at that time obtained consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat. At that time he said:

Mr. Speaker, on Friday, March 13, I called to the attention of the House the grave resentment which continues to grow in St. Louis and St. Louis County, Mo., against the avowed intention to secure the appointment of discredited machine boss, Robert E. Hannegan, to the post of collector of internal revenue.

Public sentiment continues to mount into an overwhelming wave of public indignation.

It is signified by the pointed editorial in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of March 19, 1942, which I am extending into the RECORD. As the Globe-Democrat again joins in a renewal of the fight for public decency in public places the great metropolitan press, constituting three outstanding newspapers, becomes unanimous in their opposition to this intrusion on public confidence.

Then follows the editorial, which was published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of March 19, 1942. I wish the Senate to listen to this: It reads as follows:

SMASH THE HANNEGAN APPOINTMENT

Senators Clark and Truman have recommended the President appoint Robert E. Hannegan, discredited boss of a discredited political machine, to the office of internal-revenue collector in St. Louis. Such an appointment would be in wanton disregard of public sentiment. It would be a disgraceful example of plum passing. It would reward a party henchman whose record is inextricably linked with the brazen attempt to steal the governorship of Missouri.

In opposing Hannegan for the collectorship, there is no implication that his personal integrity is not of the highest. His private and legal reputation, as far as we know, is as spotless as Caesar's wife. His political reputation is a much different story.

The issue is Hannegan, the former chairman of the city Democratic committee, the chieftain with ex-Mayor Dickmann, of the local machine, that dominated politics here for 8 years. The issue is Hannegan, the organization wheelhorse who wielded a boss regime as powerful in its own bailiwick as the late Pendergast juggernaut in Kansas City.

The issue, most specifically, is Hannegan, who, with Mayor Dickmann, sat in on the conference that started the nefarious scheme to hijack the governorship from FORREST C. DONNELL. Whether Hannegan actually counseled the partisan investigation by the Democrat-controlled assembly may be debatable. That he later backed the plan by calling for his committee's approval, that he gave tacit consent to the whole proceeding, cannot be questioned.

If Hannegan and Dickman had withdrawn support from the plot to strong-arm the governorship and seat their own candidate, Lawrence McDaniel, the whole vicious stratagem would have collapsed. They "went along." That is the most charitable view possible. It is much more likely they were silent leaders in the plan.

The Dickmann administration was rolled out of office last April by a stunning defeat—a majority of 35,694 votes against it. Four years previously Mr. Dickmann was elected by a majority of 48,170. Without a ghost of doubt, the paramount reason for the machine's crushing rejection was the conspiracy against the governorship, ultimately scotched by the State supreme court.

The public of St. Louis has repudiated the Democratic machine. Hannegan was an integral part of that machine, one of its two bosses. It becomes no less than an insult to the city's electorate for Missouri's two Senators to attempt hoisting him onto the Federal pay roll in a \$7,000 consolation coup. If this is what is called political loyalty, we have no stomach for it.

Obviously, were Hannegan to be made collector, it could hardly be called a move to resuscitate the machine. Federal service is under a pretty strict merit system. But St. Louis has a healthy intolerance for a political credo that damns public opinion and dishes out rewards to discarded machine bosses.

Senator Clark and Senator Truman had better reconsider their Hannegan recommendation. If they don't, we urge the President to ignore senatorial privilege and smash the attempt to secure Hannegan's appointment.

His appointment was made. He was nominated on May 4, 1942, and the appointment was reported favorably on May 5. I do not know whether a meeting of the committee was held; but he was nominated on one day, reported favorably on the next day, and confirmed by unanimous consent on May 6. There was no yea and nay vote. Mr. Clark of Missouri addressed the Senate, urged confirmation of Mr. Hannegan's nomination despite the statement which had been made in the St. Louis-Post-Dispatch. I have not read his statement fully. I had better not say whether he comments on the Globe Democrat.

In 1943 Mr. Hannegan was appointed to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue. On October 4 the nomination was referred to the committee. On October 5 it was reported favorably, and on October 6 it was unanimously confirmed. On motion by Mr. Clark of Missouri, and unanimously agreed to, it was ordered that the President of the United States be notified of the confirmation, and on October 7 Mr. Hannegan took office as Commissioner of Internal Revenue. On January 22, 1944, he was made chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

Mr. President, before completing my remarks I desire to make a very brief recapitulation of the points which I think are unanswerable that the Senate is entitled to have this nomination recommended to the committee. If any other Senator desires to be heard while I hold the floor, I shall, with pleasure, yield to him. (After a short pause.) I assume that no other Senator desires to be heard.

For the following reasons there should be granted by this body, by unanimous consent, an order recommending the nomination of Mr. Hannegan to be Postmaster General to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads: First, because the nomination was not presented at a meeting of the committee; second, there is no urgency which would prevent holding hearings on the matter; and third, the importance of filling this Cabinet office with a proper person. Consideration should be given to the fact that the office is a Cabinet office. Consideration should also be given to the volume of business which the Post Office Department transacts, the number of its employees, as indicated in peacetime, which is the largest of any department of the Government; its contractual duties; and the fact that the employees of 42,000 post offices are under civil service. All these facts indicate the importance of the office.

Next, as I have already indicated, is the fact that the Postmaster General is generally regarded as one who exercises a great deal of influence in the entire field of Federal patronage. The next reason is that when Postmaster General Walker resigned as party chairman he gave as his reason the fact that due to the war and the constantly growing volume of post-office business, the office of Postmaster General had become so important as to require the full time and energy of the Postmaster General. Yet, Mr. Hannegan is reported to have made the decision to retain his position as chairman of the Democratic National

Committee while occupying the office of Postmaster General. The Senate is entitled to know how Mr. Hannegan can find time to perform the duties of both positions if Mr. Walker could not do so. Moreover, the duties of Postmaster General and those of the chairman of the National Democratic Committee are inconsistent and incompatible.

Finally, I cite the series of incidents which occurred in Missouri not only 1 day but over a long period of years, from the time that Mr. Hannegan became interested in politics. The committee is entitled to examine into those facts, hear Mr. Hannegan's side of the question, and determine whether or not he is of the type of man to be appointed. The committee should hear fully from him, and from every witness which the committee wishes to summon.

So, Mr. President, at this time I respectfully request unanimous consent of this body that the nomination of Robert E. Hannegan to be Postmaster General of the United States be recommended to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McKELLAR. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DONNELL. Objection having been made, I respectfully move that the nomination of Robert E. Hannegan be recommended to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Hawkes	Overton
Ball	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bilbo	Hill	Revercomb
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Buck	La Follette	Shipstead
Burton	Langer	Smith
Bushfield	Lucas	Stewart
Butler	McFarland	Taft
Capper	McKellar	Taylor
Chavez	McMahon	Tunnell
Cordon	Maybank	White
Donnell	Millikin	Wiley
Downey	Mitchell	Willis
Ellender	Moore	Wilson
Ferguson	Morse	Young
Green	Murdoch	
Hart	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. McKELLAR obtained the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I addressed the Chair in order that I might answer the quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair previously recognized the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, a number of Senators have come into the Chamber, and I wish their names might be put on the roll call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee yielded to me. A quorum call was just had, and I desire to be recorded as present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I make the same request.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I should like to have the same privilege accorded the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] will be recorded as present.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, returning to the question before the Senate, I desire to say that it is quite remarkable how we sometimes do things in the Senate. The nomination of Mr. Robert E. Hannegan, of Missouri, has been sent in for confirmation as Postmaster General, and we have just listened to a very fine and delightful speech by one of the Senators from Missouri, my distinguished friend [Mr. DONNELL]. About nine-tenths of his speech was a rehash from the public press of a political controversy between Democrats and Republicans of Missouri. I can understand why my good friend would feel very much interested in both present and past and possibly future politics in Missouri, but I am wondering whether or not that constitutes a reason why Mr. Hannegan's nomination to be Postmaster General should not be confirmed.

Let me say to my Republican friends that most of them have been here for several years and, by implication at any rate, they voted for Mr. Hannegan on two former occasions. Nominations of Mr. Hannegan have been confirmed twice by the Senate. He was confirmed on May 6, 1942, as collector of internal revenue for the first district of Missouri, a very important office. I have never heard of any defalcations or charges of wrongdoing in that office. Some political successes of Mr. Hannegan have been charged against him, but my distinguished friend from Missouri has not said a word against Mr. Hannegan's character or his ability.

Let me digress sufficiently long to say that when we think of the results of the election last November, with Mr. Hannegan at the head of the Democratic campaign effort, it is no wonder that nothing is said about Mr. Hannegan's ability, because in a very hot contest last November Mr. Hannegan won it for his candidate, even in Missouri. My distinguished friend, by his eloquence no doubt, and by his fine character was fortunate enough to be elected to the Senate by a small majority. I congratulate him on his success. He must have achieved it by the same species of speaking he has evidenced here today. But he has not said anything against the character or the ability or the honesty or integrity of Mr. Hannegan. Except for several Republicans, including the Senator from Missouri, who were not here at the time, my Republican colleagues voted for Mr. Hannegan twice.

The first time on May 6, 1942, and again on October 6, 1943. They voted both times unanimously; he obtained every vote in the Senate. They voted unanimously to confirm him for one of the most important offices of this country, indeed probably the most important so far as a man of integrity is concerned, namely, the office of Commissioner of Internal Revenue, one of the greatest money offices in the Government. They unanimously voted for him; there was no opposition. So, when his nomination was sent to the Senate a few days ago, he having been confirmed by this body twice in the recent past, I assure my colleagues that it never occurred to me that there would be any opposition to the nomination.

Mr. Hannegan has won his spurs. I think the senior Senator from Missouri should take off his hat to him. It is an excellent thing to take one's hat off to an opponent sometimes when the opponent has done well, and certainly Mr. Hannegan did well last November. Many Republicans then thought he was not going to do so well as he did, but he made a good campaign, and he won a great victory.

I wish to call attention to some of the things which have been said. First of all, the Senator from Missouri takes me to task for having done something irregular, so to speak. Before I start to speak about that, however, I wish to say to the Senator that if he had come to me last Thursday and had said he wanted a hearing, that he would like to have the nomination go over, that he wanted certain witnesses called, and that this nominee was dishonest, or if he had made any other charge, I would, of course, have accommodated the Senator. If he had brought me all the newspaper clippings he has put into the *RECORD* today about Mr. Hannegan, I do not think I would have paid any attention to them, but certainly if he had come to me and said he wanted to be heard, of course he would have been heard. He is a member of the committee. But he chose another plan. He wanted to make an issue. I think there are two Senators on the other side who want to make an issue of this nomination, who want to overturn, as the Senator now wants to overturn, as he has just moved to overturn, a rule which has stood for many years.

I am not sure whether the rule was started by Republicans or not, but even in my time I remember when Mr. Will Hays was chairman of the National Republican Committee, and was also Postmaster General. Mr. Hays was a very delightful gentleman, and, so far as I can now recall, he made a very excellent Postmaster General. The fact that he had been in politics, as we have all been in politics, was not held against him. What Senator is there who has not been in politics? I say to my friend, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] sitting here before me, that he should not look at me in the way he is doing, because he has been in politics, and he cannot tell me any different. [Laughter.] We have all been in politics.

A man who is in politics is not a criminal, he is not dishonest necessarily.

Sometimes he is, but very rarely. During all the years of its existence there have been very few in this body who have been dishonest, I am very happy to say.

Are we to say that a man who has been confirmed twice to high public office by this body should not be confirmed because some newspapers have said evil things against him? If my name came before this body for confirmation, I would never have a chance in the world if Senators should consider newspaper statements as ground for disqualification, because I presume that as much evil has been said about me by the newspapers as has been said about any other Member of this body, and probably more.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I call attention to the fact that, as we all know, the two confirmations of Mr. Hannegan, to which the Senator from Tennessee has called attention, happened since 1940, since the events upon which the Senator from Missouri bases his entire case.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true, and I thank the Senator from Illinois for the interruption and for the information. Since the controversy took place, the Senate twice confirmed this man, who was involved in the controversy, according to the newspaper stories read by the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. When it appeared that Mr. Hannegan's nomination was to be held up here today, I had occasion to talk with him, and I asked him whether or not he was a party to what took place in Missouri as it has been related. He assured me that he was not, that at the time he and his family were in Florida, and that he had issued a public statement after that saying he was in no wise responsible for it.

Mr. President, I am not intimately acquainted with Mr. Hannegan. I have met him a few times, but, frankly, I have been impressed with the fact that he is a very high class and very honorable gentleman.

I have also had occasion to inquire as to his activities when he was Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Bureau and I was told by a disinterested party, who was a civil-service employee, that during the short time Mr. Hannegan was in the Bureau he put into effect more reforms than anyone else had inaugurated for a long time. So far as I am concerned, I shall vote to confirm Mr. Hannegan, and I think he will make a very able Postmaster General.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Missouri merely suggested that the nomination be recommended to the committee, in order that these matters might be looked into and Mr. Hannegan given an opportunity to state what are the facts, as it seems he stated them to the Senator from Montana. I still think that Mr. Hannegan himself should prefer to have an op-

portunity to appear before the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have not talked with Mr. Hannegan. I saw him for probably one-eighth of a minute last night as he and his wife walked through the vestibule of the hotel where I reside, so I do not know what he wants done about the matter, and I cannot say. I wish to say, however, that, as my colleagues know, we feel in certain instances that we know about certain matters. I was a trial lawyer for about 18 years before coming to Congress, did little else but try cases, and I had to look jurors and judges constantly in the face. There was not so much trouble with the judges, but I had to look jurors in the face regularly, and I came to feel that I could judge a man after I had had opportunity to look him in the face.

I think that the first time I ever met Mr. Hannegan was last July. I may have met him before, but it would have been just a passing introduction, and I have not seen him five times since; indeed, I doubt if I have seen him three times since then. If ever I saw an honest look on a man's face, I saw such a look on Bob Hannegan's face. He is a straight man. I would vouch for him from my knowledge of men generally, having looked at him. We can look at a man and tell whether he is an honest man—if we look carefully enough [laughter]—and I believe Bob Hannegan to be a perfectly honest man.

Mr. Hannegan is not only honest, but he is able. The last campaign was a difficult one for any party. There is no doubt about that. Even the Republicans admit it, because they really thought they were going to win in that campaign. But Bob Hannegan was the master of that situation. The chairman of the national committee is always master of the situation if he succeeds, and Hannegan succeeded. He did well, and, so far as I know and believe, he is a man who meets every specification which was suggested by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] a little while ago.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. All we have to do, in considering Mr. Hannegan, is to judge by the experience of any Member of this body. Which Member of this body would be here if his qualifications were dependent upon what the opposing newspapers stated about him? I think the record should be consulted in these particular instances. Politically Mr. Hannegan has done wonderfully well, and, as the Senator from Tennessee has stated, I think he has shown that he could fill perfectly the office to which he has been appointed. On the two different occasions to which the Senator from Tennessee has referred, this body scrutinized Mr. Hannegan's integrity, and his ability, in connection with positions which are just as important as that of Postmaster General, in my opinion. A man could be Postmaster General who would not qualify as collector of internal revenue. Possibly he would not look into the ramifications and details of his office. But on two different occasions,

when Mr. Hannegan was appointed collector of internal revenue for the St. Louis district, and when he was appointed to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue, the incidents which took place in 1940 were rather recent. If they had been really serious, surely this body would have heard of them.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator from New Mexico. If they had been serious they might have saved the Republicans a great deal of trouble, because they might then have fixed matters so that Mr. Hannegan could not have waged the successful campaign he waged.

Mr. President, in all frankness I wish to talk about the rule which the two Senators on the other side of the aisle desire to change. The rule has been in existence ever since I have known anything about the Post Office Department, which is now a period of about 35 years.

When a nomination comes to the committee it is sent to the various members of the committee. In this instance this is what was sent to them:

Ordered, That the following nomination be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Robert E. Hannegan, of Missouri, to be Postmaster General, effective July 1, 1945, vice Frank C. Walker, resigned.

On this paper we find the following signatures:

ALLEN J. ELLENDER, CHAVEZ, McKELLAR, HAYDEN, BAILEY, JOHN L. McCLELLAN, LEE O'DANIEL, GLEN H. TAYLOR, CLYDE M. REED, B. B. HICKENLOOPER, WILLIAM LANGER.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] at first protested, but after consultation with me he withdrew his protest. I consulted with him, because I have nothing in the world to cover up in any manner, shape, or form. I consulted with him, and after talking the matter over he said he would not object.

The objection came from the Republican leader, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], who very courteously asked that the nomination go over until today, and that was done.

I have never been asked for a hearing on this nomination by anyone. The distinguished member of my own committee who is now fighting the nomination never asked me about it. He is objecting to the rule. So is the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. Both Senators object to the rule. The rule has been in existence from time immemorial, so far as I know.

By the way, there are Senators present who, I believe, enjoyed the benefits of this rule. I know that one of the finest men God ever made, who is sitting back here with his hand to his face, and his name is JOSIAH W. BAILEY, was confirmed as collector of internal revenue of North Carolina 35 or 40 years ago under exactly the same rule. The practice has continued all the time. There have been some objections raised to it. My friend the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] does not like the rule very much. I think he has frequently expressed his disapproval of it. But the Senate has adopted the rule. It is a part of the Rules of the Senate. It may be a wrong rule. If the Senator from Missouri thinks it is a wrong rule, or if the Senator from Oregon thinks it is a wrong rule, let them

submit a resolution, and let it go to the Rules Committee and let that committee and the Senate pass on it. The Rules Committee is still in existence. The Senate is still in existence. If the rule is wrong, change the rule.

Mr. President, both Senators to whom I have just referred are new Members of the Senate, and excellent ones, too. After they have been here for a while and realize how many nominations come before various committees I think they will think better of it and promptly change their views. They are now in this indirect manner trying to attempt to make a precedent for the purpose of changing the rule. So far as I am concerned, I probably would have made a mistake if the Senator from Missouri had come to me and said he wanted a hearing, but after hearing his political speech of 2 hours, in which he said he wanted to rehash things that happened away back yonder before Mr. Hannegan was twice confirmed by this very body, I think it was very fortunate that the Senator did not come to me and that we did not change the rule. I think we ought to vote on the nomination this afternoon, and the sooner the better. I shall not take long, but I will yield to the Senator from Missouri, who has been on his feet for some time.

Mr. DONNELL. May I ask the Senator from Tennessee if the Senate manual which I hold in my hand contains the official Rules of the Senate, and whether there is any rule anywhere by which a committee is authorized to act without holding hearings?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am not sure about whether it is in the manual. I have not looked at it lately. I will say to the Senator that since I have been in the Senate that question has been raised a number of times, as the Parliamentarian will tell the Senator, and every time the Senate has held that a report on a nomination by poll was a legal and proper report under the rules. If the Senator has any doubt about it he can make a point of order. I shall conclude in a few moments, and I suggest to the Senator that when I am through he make the point of order that a favorable report by poll is not in order.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Tennessee referred to me kindly, as he always does—

Mr. McKELLAR. I could do not anything else.

Mr. WHITE. And said in substance that I do not think much of this rule; indeed I do not think anything of this rule, I want to supplement what the Senator has said. I do not think much of this rule; I do not think anything of this rule, except that it is a thoroughly vicious practice.

Mr. President, it is a practice which has been followed in the Senate for some time—I have to admit that much—but I believe that it is a violation of the written rules of the Senate; the standing rules of this body. I believe it is a practice which is thoroughly reprehensible. I wish there were some way to stop it. I think what we have here today is a per-

fect illustration of the infirmity and of the inherent harm in the practice.

I do not like to speak of it as a rule, but rather as a practice. If the rules of the Senate had been followed this matter would have been referred to a committee, and then there would have been a committee meeting; there would have been opportunity formally to present the request for an investigation. It always has seemed to me, and it seems to me now, that that is the correct and proper and orderly procedure, and might well result in avoiding situations similar to the one we have here today.

Mr. McKELLAR. My recollection is that on a former occasion, and that is probably where I obtained my information concerning his views, the Senator from Maine made a point of order that a report from a committee—I do not know whether it was from my committee, but from some committee—when a poll was taken of the members of the committee, was not a proper report. The Senator made a point of order against it, and the Chair overruled the point of order, and the Senate sustained the Chair. That is my recollection.

Mr. WHITE. I have no recollection whether I made the point of order or not.

Mr. McKELLAR. Some Senator did.

Mr. WHITE. Notwithstanding the point of order, notwithstanding the ruling of the Chair, and notwithstanding the practices and the precedents of the past, I still insist that it is all wrong.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I do not want to enter into the question whether this is a rule or not. I think clearly it is not a rule. I assume what the Senator is saying is that it is a precedent of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. It certainly is.

Mr. TAFT. I think that in this case it is not a precedent of the Senate. On pages 4132 and 4131 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, appears the following:

Executive nominations received May 3.

Robert E. Hannegan, of Missouri.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Robert E. Hannegan, of Missouri, to be Postmaster General.

The same day the report came in and, I think, actually before it was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, a report was made. Certainly the practice, if there is a practice, when such a nomination comes in, is to refer it first to the Senators of the State from which the appointment is made.

That is the regular practice. I am constantly receiving from the Senator's committee the nominations of postmasters in Ohio, which, so far as I know, I have invariably approved. In this case that practice was not followed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; that practice was followed in this case.

Mr. TAFT. I understood the Senator from Missouri to state that until after the report had been signed by 11 Members, and was then presented to him, no official statement was made to him.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The facts are that on the 3d of May there was brought to me a paper which had some signatures on it. I do not know how many there were. It was the paper a copy of which I hold in my hand. It begins:

Ordered, That the following nomination be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads—

And concludes with the words "with the recommendation the nomination be confirmed," following which are various signatures. That paper was presented to me at my desk. I had never been spoken to directly or indirectly before it was presented to me. When it came to me I looked at it and told the gentleman who handed it to me that I would not sign it at that time, that I wished to think over what I should do about it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, my secretary hands me the following note:

I submitted it to Senator DONNELL immediately after Senator REED, ranking minority Member, who had signed it.

The Senator from Kansas is the ranking minority member of the committee, and my secretary assumed that he ought to submit it to him first. He then submitted it to the Senator from Missouri.

It never occurred to me in the remotest way that there would be any objection to the nomination of this Cabinet officer.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I understand the Senator's statement; but the point I wish to make is that if there is a precedent regarding nominations in the Senate, it is that when they are received they shall be first referred to the Senators from the State in which the nomination is made, for their opinions and views. When their views have been received, whether adverse or favorable, a nomination may then be submitted by a poll to the members of the committee. I do not believe that is a good practice. But I do not think there is any rule or precedent of the Senate which justifies a nomination coming here in the middle of the afternoon and being circulated among members of the committee and signed without consulting the Senators from the particular State, and without other Senators even knowing that the nomination has been received. Senators may be out of the city. It seems to me that there is no precedent of the Senate to justify the procedure which has been followed in this case.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, we might as well be perfectly frank. The Democratic Senator from Missouri was in favor of this nomination, and the Republican Senator from Missouri was against the nomination. That is all there is to it.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD and Mr. DONNELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield first to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I am not acquainted with Mr. Hannegan,

but I have friends who are acquainted with him, and who speak very highly of him and his work. Personally, I have no knowledge of his qualifications.

However, while it is not a rule, it has been the custom, when a nomination is received, particularly an important nomination, to refer it to the Senators from the particular State. I have never insisted upon it, but I believe that it is a courtesy which is usually accorded.

Mr. McKELLAR. It always is. It was accorded in this case.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. As to polling the committee, it is my impression that it is usually understood that when a committee is polled, and every member of the committee is consulted, that is considered a proper procedure; but a poll of the committee is proper only when all the members of the committee are consulted.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no. The Senator is mistaken.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That is not a fixed rule. We know what the fixed rule of the Senate is. There is nothing wrong about polling a committee. It is a precedent.

Mr. McKELLAR. It has been in effect for 35 years to my certain knowledge.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. It is the practice.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; it has been the practice for 35 years.

Let me say to the Senator and to the Senate that I am told that during this war several hundred thousand appointments have been reported from the Military Affairs Committee alone. If we had to have a party fight over every military appointment which comes before the Senate, we would not be a legislative body at all. We would be a political body.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not believe that the Committee on Military Affairs follows the practice of taking signatures on a sheet of paper when recommendations come from the White House or from the Chief of Staff for promotions of officers. The Military Affairs Committee has exercised care, and has scrutinized such appointments. In many cases it has sent for the history and records of the men who were promoted. So the practice of the Committee on Military Affairs can hardly be used as a reason for taking a poll of part of a committee in order to receive a report on a nomination from a committee on the same day on which the nomination is received, without any opportunity to investigate the appointment of an individual to the high office of a member of the Cabinet. There is nothing that the Senate Committee on Military Affairs has done which would constitute a precedent for such haste.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Mr. President, in order to demonstrate how our memories sometimes fail us, let me cite one instance. I do not see the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs present.

Mr. AUSTIN. No; he is in Europe.

Mr. McKELLAR. Within the past 10 days the Senate had before it a long list of military appointments. It must have occupied a dozen pages in the RECORD. They were submitted to the Senate and were announced from the desk. I believe my friend, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] asked unanimous consent that the entire list of military nominations be approved without being sent to a committee. As I remember, they were approved without even being sent to a committee. Is that true?

Mr. HILL. I believe the Senator has reference to the nominations of midshipmen in the Navy.

Mr. McKELLAR. Perhaps that was it.

Mr. HILL. A few days ago, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, asked that a very large number of nominations of graduates of the Navy Academy be confirmed.

Mr. McKELLAR. There were several hundred of them.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. We have routine promotions in large numbers, but they are passed on by the committee. They are passed on en bloc unless there is reason for a detailed investigation by the committee. However, that does not constitute a precedent for the peculiar action which occurred in connection with this nomination.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator think there is something wrong about this action?

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not pass judgment. However, I believe that when a member of a standing committee of the Senate asks that opportunity be given for a hearing, his request should be granted.

Mr. McKELLAR. He did not make the request until after he had made a political speech lasting 2 hours today. That was the first time he ever made the request.

Mr. AUSTIN. It is a matter of right.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not agree with the Senator, under the circumstances.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The able Senator from Tennessee has referred to the practice of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McKELLAR. The particular incident to which I was referring related to the Committee on Naval Affairs. I was mistaken. However, the Committee on Military Affairs follows the same practice.

Mr. REVERCOMB. No. The Committee on Military Affairs does not follow that practice. So far as I know, every appointment on which the Committee on Military Affairs acts comes before the committee and must come before it. I recall that last year one of the attachés of the Committee on Military Affairs attempted to deal with some appointments by polling the committee. That practice was objected to, and has not been indulged in since, so far as I know.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I merely wish to ask the Senator from Tennessee a question. I have heard a great deal of comment about this particular nomination, and about technical rules and procedure. I have always had the idea that the President of the United States was entitled to select the persons whom he might choose to be members of his own official family or Cabinet. But I have always had in my own mind this particular reservation, namely, that that person should be a man of fitness and character.

I listened to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELLY] review the political scandals of his State—to his own great satisfaction, I am sure—but I did not hear him say a single word against the fitness or the character of the nominee.

I ask the Senator from Tennessee whether that question was raised.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not hear it raised. If the Senator from Missouri made a statement reflecting upon Mr. Hannegan's fitness or his character, I did not hear it—and I sat here all the time, except for about 2 minutes.

Mr. HATCH. Then, Mr. President, in that respect I wish to say that the confirmation of the nomination of a member of the President's Cabinet is on a somewhat different basis than the confirmation of the nomination of postmaster of Squedink or Podunk.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to conclude my remarks very shortly. All I wish to say is that, there being nothing against the character or fitness of Mr. Hannegan—he has held high office, he has been very much in the public eye, of course, because of his connection as chairman of the Democratic National Committee—it seems to me there can be no question in the world about his qualifications.

It is said that he should not be confirmed because he is now chairman of the Democratic National Committee. That question was raised by the Senator from Missouri, I believe. That practice, as I recall from my recollection of history, was begun by Mr. Harding, when Will Hays, a very estimable gentleman, who had led the Republican Party to a glorious victory, as they looked at it, was made Postmaster General, and he was also continued as chairman of the Republican National Committee.

My recollection is that later on, in a subsequent administration—I have forgotten which one, whether it was Mr. Coolidge's or Mr. Hoover's—a man who was either chairman or assistant chairman of the Republican National Committee was made Postmaster General.

My recollection is that James A. Farley then came in; and following the example set by a successful Republican in their day, the Democrats appointed the chairman of their national committee to be Postmaster General. He made an excellent one.

Now the nomination of Mr. Hannegan is before us. The Democrats now have nominated Mr. Hannegan—again following the leadership of the Republicans. We followed them on the question of polling the committee. That is what

they used to do; it was a general practice in Republican days, as well as in Democratic days. But now the Republicans wish to stop the practice—insofar as the Democratic Party is concerned.

Mr. President, I have no doubt that if some day the Republicans secure as a chairman of their national committee a man who leads them to a successful result and a fine victory, they will change their minds, and they will wish to put him in office, just as Mr. Hannegan is to be put in.

Mr. Hannegan is a fine man. He has a wonderful personality. He is well educated. He is a graduate of a splendid college in Missouri. He is a man who stands well. He is a man who knows how to fight. He is a man who knows how to win. He is a man who knows how to handle himself.

From a political point of view I can see why the Republicans should be opposed to him. I do not know about all the fights the Senator from Missouri has had in Missouri, but it may be that Missourians will fight again, and I do not blame them for not wanting Mr. Hannegan to be Postmaster General. But practically all the other Republican Senators have voted for him for two other high offices. If they vote against him now they will have to change their practice, they will have to change their votes, because they all voted for him in 1942 and 1943. They will have to say their votes were wrong, that the Senator from Missouri is their leader, and that they are going to follow him and take back the votes they heretofore cast for Mr. Hannegan.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Tennessee did not go far enough back in history to discover the origin of the custom relative to the nomination of Postmaster General. As I recall, Frank H. Hitchcock, who was chairman of the Republican National Committee in 1908, was made Postmaster General under President Taft.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am quite sure that is correct.

Mr. REED. I have forgotten whether he retained his chairmanship along with his position as Postmaster General.

Mr. McKELLAR. Inasmuch as the Senator has refreshed my memory, I wish to tell him about another man, namely, Harry S. New, whom most of us old-timers remember. He was a fine man, and he was Postmaster General and also chairman of the Republican National Committee. I have forgotten whether he held both positions at the same time, but he held them in the same vicinity of time, at any rate. I do not think the fact that he had been chairman of the Republican National Committee disqualified him to be Postmaster General. Harry New was one of the finest gentlemen I ever know. I always liked him. The fact that he was an excellent chairman of the Republican National Committee did not make him any less able as Postmaster General. I think he made a very excellent Postmaster General, just as Robert Hannegan will do if his nomination is confirmed this afternoon.

I hope the Republican Senators will stand by their former votes. I do not think we should reframe or attempt to change the rules. I do not think we should change the rule or the custom relative to having a Postmaster General hold both offices. That has been the custom. The only way to make a change now would be to pass a law to the effect that no man who had been chairman of a national committee should be head of the Post Office Department. I think such a law or such a rule would be a very foolish one. I think it depends on the man.

We have before us the nomination of a man as to whom not a word to his discredit has been spoken, except that he has been a successful politician. He has been, and I admire his success; I honor him for his success. He made a great fight. It seems to me there is no reason in the world why his nomination should not be confirmed.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. REED. I wish to say a few words to my good friend the Senator from Tennessee. I am in a rather peculiar position here, because I happen to be the ranking member of the minority on the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. When the clerk brought that poll to me, I signed it. I am not defending the practice of polling committees. I share to some extent the view of the Senator from Maine that it is a bad practice. But I wish to say to my good friend the Senator from Tennessee that there is no question whether the nomination of Mr. Hannegan will be confirmed. The only issues presently on trial are the practices of the Senate and Mr. Hannegan's own welfare in the future.

If the Senator had called a meeting of the committee I would have voted in favor of a committee report recommending confirmation of the nomination. I say again to the Senator from Missouri that notwithstanding what he has said here today, I voted twice in this body to confirm the nomination of Mr. Hannegan—first when he was nominated to be collector of internal revenue at St. Louis, and later when he was nominated to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue for the country as a whole; and I am familiar with what the Senator from Missouri has said.

I agree that the conditions about which he has spoken represent a disgraceful chapter in the history of politics in Missouri, as they would in any other State. They do not reflect any credit upon Mr. Hannegan. The political situation in Kansas City and in the remainder of the State is about as rotten as ever existed anywhere. When he searches his soul I believe the Senator from Missouri will perhaps agree that the dirty treatment which he received at the hands of the Democratic authorities in Missouri in 1940, after he had received a majority of the votes cast, on the face of the returns, was perhaps an important influence in his election last year to the United States Senate.

Mr. President, to me it is important that we keep the record straight. If

a meeting had been held of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads I believe I should have voted favorably upon the confirmation of Mr. Hannegan. If the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] should agree to let the nomination lie over until tomorrow, and call a meeting of the committee tomorrow morning, I think I would vote to report favorably the nomination of Mr. Hannegan notwithstanding his connection with the incidents to which reference has been made by the senior Senator from Missouri, and which were purely political in nature. After all, I have been in politics somewhat myself.

I agree with the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from New Mexico that, to a large extent, the President of the United States should be permitted to select members of his Cabinet unless the person whom he wishes to select is clearly unfit. I do not believe that Mr. Hannegan falls within that classification.

Mr. President, I think it would be wholesome for the Senate if we were to follow a procedure different from what has been followed in the past. I think the Senator from Missouri has some right to complain, although he did sleep upon his rights. I know the Senator from Tennessee has served on the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads ever since I became a Member of the Senate. I know how careful he is with the prerogatives of Senators. If at any time a suggestion had been made to the chairman of the committee that a hearing was desired, I am sure he would have called a meeting of the committee for that purpose. If the senior Senator from Missouri had suggested it to me, I, as the ranking member of the committee, would have been very happy to have asked that a meeting be held. But no suggestion of that nature was made.

I think Mr. Hannegan is now in a doubtful light. I think the best thing for him, and certainly the best thing for the Senate, is to stop where we are, and send the nomination back to the committee for further consideration. If that is done, and the chairman will call a meeting of the committee in the morning—

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] or the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] had come to me last week and asked for a committee hearing, I assure them that a meeting of the committee would have been called. But inasmuch as no statement or request concerning the matter was made, and inasmuch as an attack has now been made on a practice which has been followed by the committee for at least 35 years, I do not feel like going any further. I assert to my friend that I have not done anything dishonorable in this matter, and I shall not be placed in the position of trying to put over some sharp practice. I think that the Senator from Missouri owed the obligation to me, as well as to the Senator from Kansas of making the proper request to one or the other of us instead of coming to the floor of the Senate, as he has done, with a statement attacking the method which was followed by the committee and which has been in vogue for at least 35 years.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Tennessee does not consider anything that I have said as being a reflection upon him.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I ask the Senator from Tennessee if the only purpose of holding a committee meeting would not be to hear evidence as to the fitness or unfitness of the nominee, Robert Hannegan, to hold the office for which he has been nominated?

Mr. McKELLAR. That would be the purpose.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] has had a Committee of the Whole of the Senate for 2 hours today.

Mr. McKELLAR. He has.

Mr. McMAHON. I have listened very carefully. I have not heard one single word in what we might term the Committee of the Whole which would reflect upon the integrity or fitness of the nominee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct. I have heard that there was considerable politics in Missouri from time to time, and that sometimes Mr. Hannegan won and sometimes he did not.

Mr. McMAHON. So, if the suggestion of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] were to be adopted, and the nomination recommitted to the committee, the Senator from Missouri would consume a couple of hours to present to the committee the same speech and the same facts which he presented to the Senate today. From the speech we have already listened to we have not learned anything with respect to the qualifications of Mr. Hannegan, who has been nominated by the President to be Postmaster General of the United States, that reflect on Mr. Hannegan's fitness for the office. Therefore we would do a useless thing if we were to heed the suggestion of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. President, I have been very much interested in the discussion today. If the Senate will bear with me for a few minutes I shall undertake to present some of the facts which I know exist with regard to conditions in the State of Missouri.

A short time ago I was attending a national convention. It was not a political convention, but a convention of delegates, and considerable dissension was existing among the delegates from Missouri. One of the high ranking members of the convention came to me and said, "Can you not get these fellows from Missouri together?" I replied, "Get them together; hell, I cannot keep them apart." [Laughter.] That is an example of the trouble we have been having in Missouri politics. We have not been able to get together, and we have had trouble in keeping apart.

Mr. President, the very distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] made six points as a basis upon which we should not confirm the nomination of a distinguished son of Missouri.

With reference to the first five points I would not deign to raise my voice, as I am the youngest of the younger Members present. I do not know what the procedure of the Senate has been in the past, and I do not know what it now should be. But with reference to the sixth point which was raised by the senior Senator from Missouri, namely, that of Bob Hannegan's political life in the State of Missouri, I do feel that I can testify.

I was the president pro tempore of the Missouri State Senate when the so-called contest was filed. I believe I know as much about that contest as does any man in the State of Missouri, the distinguished senior Senator from that State not excepted. I know that Bob Hannegan was not a member of the State committee at the time to which reference has been made. He had nothing to do with filing the contest. Bob Hannegan was a Democrat. Bob Hannegan supported what the Democratic majority of the senate and house said should be done. I believe there is no Member present on this side or on the other side of the aisle who would not support his party after it had taken a stand upon a particular question.

The senior Senator from Missouri proceeds to tell the whole story, and, as several of my colleagues have said, not one word has been given to Senators to convince them or to indicate that Mr. Hannegan in any way is not efficient, that he is not honest, that he is not capable, that he would not make a good Postmaster General. In fact, the record shows that each of these qualifications exists in Mr. Hannegan's personality.

Mr. Hannegan made the most outstanding success as collector of internal revenue in the St. Louis district that has ever been made, and if the senior Senator from Missouri had taken the time to read the self-same newspapers from which he has been quoting today, he would have read editorials in which it was said that Bob Hannegan's record as a public servant was above reproach, and that he had made good. Even the *Globe-Democrat*, which the senior Senator from Missouri admits is a Republican newspaper, urged confirmation. I would not go so far as to agree with him as to some of his statements about some of the other newspapers; there have been times in which they have leaned toward the Democratic Party, but that has been rare, but only last Sunday, yesterday, I was in the city of St. Louis, and I read in the *Globe-Democrat* an editorial in which it was said that the Senate should confirm the nomination of Bob Hannegan. So if we are to bring the record in, let us bring it down to date.

I read a little story a few days ago with which I shall conclude my brief remarks. It is said that a father was trying to get rid of his son and some of his questions, and he tore up a newspaper in which there was a map of the world and said, "Son, go out and put that together, and when you have it put together come back and talk to me." In about 2 minutes the boy came back with the paper put together. The father said, "Son, how in the world have you solved

that problem so quickly?" The son answered, "Father, there was a man on the other side of the paper, and when the man was put together, I found out that the world came out all right."

Mr. President, in this case we are considering a man, and we should not consider any trivial or side issues. Bob Hannegan deserves confirmation by the Senate. He has been confirmed twice before unanimously, and it is my opinion that he not only deserves confirmation, but that he deserves it today. I hope the Senate will not vote to recommit the nomination, and turn the mosquitoes of politics loose on him only to harass him, not to do any good. I hope the Senate will stand firm.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate for only a few minutes in discussing the issue before us, and to make two matters as clear as possible. First, I shall discuss a matter of procedure, in regard to confirmation of members of the President's Cabinet, and, second, I desire to refer very briefly to some of the principles and tests which I think should be applied in confirming members of the President's Cabinet.

I have listened to the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee, for whom I have the highest respect, and let me say, he has been very kind to me by way of giving me, from time to time since I have been a Member of the Senate, some very valuable "Dutch uncle" advice. I judge from his remarks that there has grown up in the Senate over a 35-year period, not a rule, although when first discussed by him today he talked of it in terms of being a rule, but as the discussion continued we have learned that it is a practice, not a rule, a precedential practice.

As the senior Senator from Missouri pointed out, we cannot find it, as a rule, in the book of Senate rules which has been handed us as freshmen. I have made very serious study of those rules, to acquaint myself with them, so that I could be of maximum service to my constituents and to my colleagues in the Senate. But there is not such a rule, and now we are told it is a practice.

I think we need to analyze that practice. I am glad the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], chairman of the Special Committee to Study the Need for Revision of the Senate Rules and Practices, is present, because I wish to say that, in my humble judgment, there is very strong feeling throughout the country that some of the moss-covered rules of the Senate need to be brought out for public airing and revision. I certainly know of no procedure with which I have had personal experience that is more deserving of revision—yes, abolition, by the Senate—than this one. Let us see how this so-called 29-year-old practice works in practice.

Slips of paper are passed to us in the Chamber by the clerk of the committee. Frequently we do not know when he comes to us that he is a clerk. He whispers some instructions while the debate is proceeding, and asks if we have any objection to a nomination or a list of nominations set forth on the slips. If a Senator has one ear listening to the speaker

and the other listening to the clerk, he may with a nod of his head give the clerk the impression that he favors a nomination which he has not had time duly to consider. So I say that that particular practice is a bad one, because these matters of appointment should at least receive the solemnity of due consideration by members of a committee when the clerk is in his office, not on the floor of the Senate, while debate is proceeding. Taking a poll of committee members while they are on the floor of the Senate listening to Senate debate is not a proper way to conduct committee business.

Not only that, Mr. President, but it appears that under this practice when the clerk gets reports from a majority of the committee by Senators either giving him a nod of the head or telling him that they favor the nomination, or that they will not object to the nomination, the clerk goes to the chairman of the committee, and the next thing we hear as a result of that sort of polling is a statement from the chairman of the committee, such as that set forth on page 4121 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 3d, a statement by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the chairman of the committee:

Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, I report favorably the nomination of Robert E. Hannegan to be Postmaster General, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I shall yield in a moment. As a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads I was not even extended the courtesy of a poll by the clerk of the committee, let alone any statement from the chairman of the committee in regard to the appointment.

I now yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. In the first place, I wish to read rule XXXVIII, on page 43 of the Rules of the Senate:

When nominations shall be made by the President of the United States to the Senate, they shall, unless otherwise ordered—

This is what happens to the nominations unless otherwise ordered; the Senate can take them from the desk and act on them.

They shall, unless otherwise ordered, be referred to appropriate committees and the final question on every nomination shall be, "Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?" which question shall not be put on the same day on which the nomination is received, nor on the day on which it may be reported by a committee, unless by unanimous consent.

So that I say to the Senator that in this very rule the Senate itself states how the matter shall be handled. The committee can make its report in writing, it can have a meeting and report it from a meeting.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have not the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say that, after listening to the reading of the rule, I find not one word in it which justifies the interpretation the distinguished Senator from Tennessee

has made. There is not one word which would justify an interpretation that the chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads has the authority, under the rule, to notify the Senate of the United States that the committee reports a nomination when at least one member of the committee was not even consulted in regard to it. If that is the sort of rule or practice the Senate is working under, I think it is high time the people of the United States understand how the Senate proceeds to carry on its important business, such as that involving the nomination and confirmation of a Postmaster General of the United States.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I wish to observe that what was read from the rule vests no authority in any committee whatever to make the "otherwise" arrangement. That rule requires action by the Senate in order to make an arrangement otherwise.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I find that in 1934 the following resolution was adopted by the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Resolved by the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, That, until further notice, all post office nominations shall be submitted by the Clerk of the committee to the two Senators of the State in which the post offices are situated respectively. If the two Senators recommend or okay such nominations, or, if, after submission to them, they do not object to such confirmation, the chairman of the committee is authorized and directed to report such nomination favorably to the Senate.

That, Mr. President, has been the rule for 11 years. A majority of the committee acted exactly in accord with that rule. The majority of the committee approved the nomination.

The Senator from Oregon said the nomination was not submitted to him. I want to tell the Senator why it was not submitted to him. My clerk said he hunted everywhere for the Senator and could not find him. The Senator was not on the floor of the Senate during that time. I do not know where he was. But he was not on the floor of the Senate. That is why it was not submitted to him.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to reply immediately to that statement. I wish to say that if the clerk made that statement to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee he did not help the cause of truth by the statement. I think the Senator from Tennessee is well aware of the fact that I was in the Chamber while the Senator was here on the very day in question.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator was here, but he was not here at that time.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Tennessee is likewise mistaken about that. I held a conference with the distinguished minority leader and the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] on the floor of this Senate in regard to this matter after I heard the statement of the Senator from Tennessee.

see that he was reporting the nomination to the Senate. I sat in my chair when the distinguished Senator from Tennessee made his statement, as I have quoted it from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I immediately proceeded to discuss on this side of the aisle with some of the older Senators what course of action should be followed in regard to the report of the Senator from Tennessee. I was advised, and followed the advice, that what we should do was to proceed to ask the minority leader to request that the nomination go over until the next day. That was done by the minority leader [Mr. WHITE].

All I want to say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee is that as a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads I think that each member of the committee is entitled to be contacted by the chairman before he comes into the Senate and submits a report in behalf of the committee involving the nomination of a Postmaster General.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I will not yield until I finish this part of my statement. I want to say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that I have heard his discussion in regard to the conduct of the chairman of a Senate committee. I have never been a chairman of a Senate committee, but I have been the chairman of many committees, and I never would think of making a report to the parent body of a committee of which I was chairman until I knew that the report represented the point of view, or set out the view, of each member of the committee. I think that each member of the committee was certainly entitled to have his view ascertained by the chairman of the committee before the chairman made any report in behalf of the committee.

Let us assume a case; it does not happen to be this case, but to illustrate and discuss the principle of procedure involved I think the hypothetical is a good one. Let us assume that I had reason for objecting to Mr. Hannegan's nomination on the basis of one of the tests I shall mention later. I think the procedure that is followed by the polling method, and by completely overlooking one member of the committee—and I do not know whether there were others, for I have not inquired—

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will yield I will tell him what the facts are.

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The clerk of the committee found all the members who were in Washington with the exception of two. One or two of the members of the committee were in Europe. One or two of them were on the Pacific Coast. There were only two members of the committee in Washington whom the clerk was unable to find. One was my distinguished friend the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] and the other was the Senator from Oregon who now has the floor.

The majority of the committee has acted. Eleven out of 19 have acted. I will give the names of Senators who were not in Washington.

The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] was ill, and of course he could come back and, like the Senator from Oregon, say that he did not have any notice.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] was out of the city. He was ill.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] was out of the city.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] was not on the floor.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] was not on the floor at the time the committee was polled.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTSTALL] was in Europe.

A majority of the committee has acted on the nomination. Does the Senator from Oregon contend that because he was not in the Chamber when the clerk polled the committee the whole procedure should be set aside in order to publish again a political campaign of 5 years ago? Is that the contention of the Senator? If it is, I want to say that I am opposed to changing the rule about polling of committees. I think it is a very excellent rule and was applied in a very excellent way to this particular case.

If the Senator from Oregon had come to me and asked me for a hearing, I have no doubt he would have gotten it, but he did not ask me for it, nor did the Senator from Missouri, nor did any other Senator who is now opposing the confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator from Tennessee will let me finish he will find out what my contention is, and it is not the contention which apparently the Senator would put in my mouth. However, he is in error whenever he says I was not on the floor when the poll was taken. However, if I had been absent, which I was not as the Record will show, he owed me the consideration of taking the matter up with me before he made his report to the Senate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. May I ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, if the Senator from Oregon will permit it.

Mr. MORSE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. As a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads I signed the document that was circulated among Senators because I approve the appointment of Mr. Hannegan, and I still approve it. I shall, however, on the basis of principle, support the motion of the Senator from Missouri. I think perhaps if the motion should prevail it would not change my opinion as to Mr. Hannegan's qualifications to hold this office. But the question I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee is: What opportunity did the members of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads who were absent or who were not contacted have to file minority views as should be their privilege?

Mr. McKELLAR. I think very active minority views are being filed, or being put before the Senate now, and Senators have every opportunity, if they have a

majority of the Senate with them, to defeat the nomination. But when there are no charges made of fraud or wrongdoing or improper conduct on the part of Mr. Hannegan, I do not think the Senate would do itself any great credit by going into this ancient political history.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield further to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to say that while I am of the opinion that Mr. Hannegan's nomination should be confirmed, I still believe that in orderly procedure, every Member of the Senate, whether he be a member of a committee or of the Senate in a so-called Committee of the Whole, should have every right to present his objections or to advance his approval. It is on that theory that I think Mr. Hannegan will not be hurt by a formal hearing of this matter before the committee, if it is necessary. I agree with the Senator from Oregon that this nomination should be recommitted to the committee, in the interest of common parliamentary fairness and in the public interest, for a full examination, which Mr. Hannegan can no doubt meet with flying colors if there is nothing wrong with him; and if there is something wrong with him that should disqualify him, it is time that the committee, the Senate, and the public knew about it.

I repeat that I have no reason to change my mind about Mr. Hannegan. I believe that he is an able man, and I shall support him, unless something unusual develops in connection with the consideration of his nomination. I shall, however, support the recommitment of the nomination to the committee, for such opportunity as any Member may wish to present his objections or his approval.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his remarks.

To proceed with the hypothetical situation which I was discussing I wish to point out that under the practice which we have seen illustrated in this case, when a member of a committee is not polled, assuming that he has objections to the nominee concerned, he finds himself in the position of having the chairman of the committee announce on the floor of the Senate a report from the committee based upon a poll about which the Senator concerned has never been informed. Such a practice puts a Senator who may want a committee discussion of a nomination in a very embarrassing position, in that he must either then and there raise objection, which may be misinterpreted, or he must go to the chairman of the committee and say, in effect, "Mr. Chairman, you did not talk to me about it; but now I should like to have you join with me in an effort to have the nomination referred to the committee."

Any such procedure as that is very unsound parliamentary practice. No Member of the Senate should be put in such a position in relation to the chairman of any committee. On the other hand, I believe that members of committees are entitled, from the chairman of the committee, to be fully advised in

regard to the business of the committee, and in regard to reports which the chairman of a committee intends to make to the Senate on behalf of the committee. That was not done in this case. The practice which was followed in this case should be discontinued by all committees.

My criticism is not a personal criticism of the Senator from Tennessee, but of what is, in my judgment, a very bad practice.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I should like to finish my thought.

I wish to make it perfectly clear that what I am saying is not a personal criticism of the Senator from Tennessee. I would make the same criticism of the chairman of any committee on which I might be serving if I found him following a 35-year-old practice of the Senate which, in my judgment, does such great injury to the rights of individual Members of the Senate, and puts us in a position where we must go to the chairman who follows the practice which was followed in this case and say, "Mr. Chairman, I should like to have this nomination recommitted to the committee."

I now yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator heard the report made. That was the time for him to act. It was made to the Senate. It was not made secretly. It was made openly. The report was made, and unanimous consent was asked for the consideration of the nomination. If I correctly recall, the Senator did not object then. He is very able in objecting. He has objected 3 or 4 days after he heard the report read by the chairman of the committee. Unanimous consent was asked for the consideration of the nomination; and yet the Senator claims that he has not been treated fairly. I would not treat the Senator unfairly for anything in the world.

Mr. MORSE. The minority leader did object, which made objection by me at that time unnecessary.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I agree with the Senator from Oregon, and would agree to support a motion to the effect that the Senate abide by its own rules.

On three different occasions this subject has been brought up in connection with specific nominations, but nothing has been done with regard to the prevailing practice.

One of the first things I was told as a Member of this body was that the rules were honored largely by their violation. I take issue with the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], whom I respect highly. My coattails have been very nearly torn off in the corridors around this Chamber, in efforts to have me signify my approval of nominations of general officers of the United States Army by initialing reports, in order that the nominations might be reported to the Senate without a meeting of the committee. A subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs which was

formed to investigate certain nominations was discharged a few months ago because it took a little time to conduct the investigation.

I would most heartily agree with the Senator from Oregon if his motion were to the effect that the Senate should obey its own rules. I have always taken issue with attacks on the violation of a rule when they occurred in connection with the consideration of a particular nomination.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I believe the point of the Senator from West Virginia is well taken. I am more interested in following correct procedure than I am in having the rule applied to this particular case now that the damage has been done to orderly procedure.

However, I am using this case—I believe legitimately—to point out what I think is a very bad practice in the Senate.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Again we are confronted with the proposal to change the rules in the middle of the game. We have violated the rules so frequently that I object to bringing it up in connection with one particular case. If we were to consider the rule itself, I think we would get much further. That is the only point I intended to make. I do not like to call attention to the violation of the rule in the case of a specific individual and make him suffer because of a violation which has persisted for 35 years.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am counting on the innate sense of fairness of the Senator from Tennessee, after the discussion is over, to suggest, on his own initiative, that the nomination be recommitted to the committee for report at a later date.

I now wish to take up the comment of the Senator from Tennessee with regard to failure on my part to make objection when he made his general report on May 3. Let us go to the Record and see what happened on May 3.

Immediately after the Senator from Tennessee made the suggestion that the Senate proceed to consider the nomination, the minority leader [Mr. WHITE] in keeping with the duties of his position discussed the matter with the Senator from Tennessee, and it was agreed that the nomination should be passed over until a later date. Several of us had made it clear to the Senator from Maine that we objected to the procedure which had been followed, and that we wished to have the matter go over for more deliberate consideration.

The Senator from Maine pointed out to us that in view of the fact that the nomination was to be passed over anyway, nothing further needed to be done on that occasion. I think he was quite right in that advice.

I have heard the Senator from Tennessee use the argumentative technique of pointing out that certain Senators did not raise an objection at the time. Surely I need not tell him that it is not necessary to raise a formal objection at the time when objection has already been made by other Senators and we have been notified that the nomination is to be passed over. It has been passed over,

and we are now proceeding to discuss what procedural action should be taken for further consideration of the nomination by the committee.

I disagree with the statement made by the Senator from Kansas to the effect that the Senator from Missouri slept on his rights. I do not know what rights he slept on. The moment the polling statement was handed to him he made objection. He told the clerk that he would not sign it, but that he wished to think it over. The record is perfectly clear that what he did was to proceed to discuss the matter with the senior Senator from Maine, the minority leader, and with the Senator from Ohio.

I have not heard the Senator from Missouri say that he intends to vote against the confirmation of Mr. Hannegan's nomination. If I correctly interpret his remarks, they lead to the final conclusion that he believes that the committee ought to consider the nomination and decide upon what procedure should be followed in the face of his objections.

I wish also to point out that on the basis of what has been said up to this time, the Senator from Missouri certainly has made a prima facie case to this extent, and to this extent only: He has raised certain objections based upon considerations which I believe lay the foundation for an inference that possibly Mr. Hannegan's participation in political manipulations in the State of Missouri might raise questions as to his qualifications on the ground of character. I think the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads should consider the objections raised by the senior Senator from Missouri.

That leads me to the remarks which I wish to make in regard to the tests which I have always applied, and always will apply, until someone can show that I am in error, in connection with the matter of nominations to the Cabinet. Earlier this afternoon the Senator from Tennessee made some reference to my having voted for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Wallace. At that time I tried to explain to him that he was mistaken as to the basis on which I voted for the confirmation of that nomination. I shall now try to explain in greater detail the tests which I think should be applied by the Senate in considering nominations.

At the time of the Wallace nomination I made as thorough a study as I could of the question of rejections of Cabinet nominations in the history of this country. The record shows that there have been seven rejections, out of a total of almost 400 nominations. One of them occurred in the administration of Andrew Jackson; four in President Tyler's administration; one in President Johnson's administration; and one in President Coolidge's administration.

When we make an analysis of those great Senate discussions we find, in my humble judgment, that there are four major tests, and then I think another one which runs through all four of them. The first is the character test. Is the man of good character, as that term is generally used by all? Second, is he one who believes in our form of gov-

ernment and who seeks through our form of government to bring about any particular reform which he advocates? Third, is he one who is not disqualified because of some professional or personal or financial interest in the job, so that he cannot render impartial, honest service? The Senate will remember that at the time of the Warren controversy in 1925, when President Coolidge had nominated Warren to be Attorney General, the charge was made that his connection with certain great business interests or organizations in the State of Michigan and throughout the country rendered it questionable whether he could meet the test of impartiality as Attorney General, when it came to administering the antitrust laws. It is not for me to say whether the Senate was right or wrong, although on the basis of a study of the record, I am inclined to believe that had I been a Member of the Senate at that time I would not have voted for confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Warren. I say that because, looking at the situation as it is now set out in the books, and records, I have grave doubt whether his professional connections met the test I have just mentioned.

Then, of course, there is the fourth test of mental soundness. At the time of the debate on the nomination of Mr. Wallace, when I discussed this particular test with some of my Republican colleagues, one said to me, "What do you mean by that, Wayne? Do you mean that he just is not nuts?" I said, "What I mean is that the test of mental soundness, as we apply it in the law, should be applied to any Cabinet nominee or to any nominee proposed by the President for any office."

I applied what I consider to be the four major historical tests to the Wallace nomination, and in my honest judgment he met the tests, and on the basis of those tests I voted for the confirmation of his nomination.

On the basis of those tests I will vote for the confirmation of Mr. Hannegan, unless I can be shown that he does not meet those tests.

There is also a fifth test which I think we must take into account, namely, the so-called test of competency. It is a highly subjective test. It is one which must be watched in its application, lest there be a possibility that one may be influenced by partisanship. I think it is sometimes rather easy for us to assume that the fellow in the other party is not competent, when what we mean is that his success has shown his outstanding competency, to our party's disadvantage. Nevertheless, I think it is true that when we function under the advice and consent clause of the Constitution, insofar as the confirmation of nominations is concerned, we should give weight to the question of competency, from the standpoint of whether in the particular job for which the President has appointed an individual he will be able to render service which will be for the public good and will protect the interest of our citizenry as a whole. I felt that Mr. Wallace met that test, and I have yet to be shown that Mr. Hannegan does not meet it.

However, I think it is only fair that we have at least a committee hearing on the nomination, to study the nominee's qualifications from the standpoint of meeting these tests.

Senators may disagree with me in respect to its application as a legal proposition, but let me point out that the advice-and-consent clause of the Constitution is in the form of language of limitation. The appointive authority is given by the Constitution to the President. Hence, I agree with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] in essence, I think, if I correctly understood the remarks he made a few minutes ago. I agree if by those remarks he meant that a presumption exists in favor of a Presidential nomination. I say that because we do not have joint appointive authority with the President. The framers of the Constitution did not use such language.

What the framers of the Constitution did say, in speaking of the Presidential appointive power, was—

He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, Judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States.

In my judgment the advice-and-consent language of the Constitution is language of limitation. It means that the presumption should be resolved in favor of the President, unless we find that the particular nominee falls short in respect to one of the tests I have enumerated. There is nothing among those tests, and I find nothing in the debates on the great historic cases, which would justify the making of any finding on the basis of partisanship. By that I mean that I do not think we have a right to sit here and do either one of two things: First, object to the nomination of a Cabinet officer because we do not like his politics or because he is of a political party different from ours. I think we should act non-partisanly, from that standpoint. Neither do I think we are justified in applying the test "Would we appoint him if we were in the appointing position?" That right was not given to us by the advice-and-consent clause of the Constitution. The framers of the Constitution did not say, "The President and a majority of the Senate shall appoint Cabinet officers."

Neither do I think a Cabinet nomination should be made use of in the Senate for carrying on political warfare against the President, regardless of the party to which he may belong. I do not intend, in connection with the consideration of any Cabinet appointment, to seek to make political capital out of it. I do not think a single thing said today by the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] would justify any such interpretation of his remarks. However, such interpretations already have been made on the floor of the Senate.

When another Member of the Senate raises a question such as the one which has been raised in this case, namely,

whether the particular nominee is qualified from the standpoint of the tests I have enumerated, I think I have a duty, as a Member of the Senate, to say to the committee concerned with the nomination, "You should hold a hearing on it."

If I knew Mr. Hannegan—and I do not—and if I were a close friend of his, as his friend I would say that I think it is in his interest, and certainly in the interest of the great office in which he is about to serve, to have any investigation that is requested by a member of the committee or by a Member of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Oregon made an interesting legal argument on the subject of the requisite qualifications of a person seeking appointment to a Cabinet position. I have enjoyed listening to him. I am wondering whether there is anything in his opinion, as expressed in the record up to the present moment, which would prevent Mr. Hannegan from qualifying under the tests which the Senator laid down.

Mr. MORSE. I believe that if the record in its present form is all the evidence we are to have before us when we vote on the nomination, and if the Senate does not see fit to allow the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads to interrogate the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] in regard to the implications contained in some of the material which he spread upon the RECORD today, I shall be forced to conclude that a prima facie showing has been made which justifies me in insisting that Mr. Hannegan be investigated on two grounds. The first ground would be that of character; the second, whether or not he has such professional or personal interest in the office of Democratic National chairman as to prevent him from administering impartially the duties of Postmaster General.

I make that statement on the basis of what I have heard today. Charge after charge was made, and material was presented to the effect that Mr. Hannegan had conducted himself in what I should conclude to be a corrupt manner in regard to the Missouri political disputes to which the senior Senator from Missouri has referred.

Furthermore, I say that the statements made by the Senator from Missouri, if accepted, on the basis of his experience as a qualified witness in the case, give me some concern as to whether Mr. Hannegan would use his office of Postmaster General for political purposes. However, I do not ignore the strength of the presumption in favor of the President in this instance, and hence I would prefer to have the matter go to the committee for further study.

I am inclined to believe that if and when rebuttal material is presented to the committee, perhaps Mr. Hannegan's friends will be in position to make a clean showing for him.

Unless I misunderstood the senior Senator from Missouri, he did not, contrary to what has been stated by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], present before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole the evidence

which he thinks should be brought before the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. He raised only a question in support of his request that the committee investigate and ascertain whether or not the evidence to which he has referred can be supported. In my judgment, we have not listened this afternoon, contrary to what the Senator from Connecticut has said, to a presentation on the basis of which Mr. Hannegan should be disqualified or rejected by the Senate. The senior Senator from Missouri directed his remarks only to the motion made by him that the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads hold a hearing to consider charges which then could be brought against Mr. Hannegan's qualifications. From a procedural standpoint, I think it not only fair to all of the Members of the Senate, particularly to the members of the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee, to Mr. Hannegan, and to President Truman that this nomination be sent back to committee.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask the senior Senator from Missouri, What are the charges as they relate to what the Senator from Oregon is now addressing himself, namely, corruption in the political situation in Missouri? I should like to have the Senator from Missouri tell me, if he can, what he expects to prove in respect to political corruption as it may relate to Bob Hannegan of Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon will yield to me, I may say that in answering the question it would be necessary again to bring the entire situation before the committee as I discussed it for 2 hours this afternoon. The statement made by the distinguished Senator from Oregon is correct, namely, that the position I take is that the matters to which I have referred should be heard by the committee. I am not undertaking to pass on what the decision of the committee or of the Senate should be. I have stated charges which have been made repeatedly day after day in the press of the State of Missouri with respect to the election of Mr. Hannegan, with respect to the incident of his going to Governor Park and asking that he not dismiss the election board, and with reference to other matters which I have mentioned. All of them, to my mind, raise a question which should be considered by the committee.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I am of the opinion that this is not a matter upon which the committee should be put in the position of having made a report merely because there had been a poll taken of a majority of the members of the committee—perhaps all with the exception of the Senator who is seated on my right, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. To my mind the committee itself should make a report.

During the course of my remarks I pointed out several additional reasons why the committee should hear this entire matter. I also raised the point, if the Senator will recall, that the importance of filling this Cabinet office is such that the committee should consider the qualifications of the individual who has been appointed to the office. The fact that the Postmaster General is generally

regarded as one who exerts considerable influence in the entire field of patronage, and the fact that Mr. Hannegan has indicated his intention of retaining the post of Chairman of the Democratic National Committee while at the same time occupying the office of Postmaster General, whereas Postmaster General Walker found in his experience that the duties of the office should occupy the full attention and energy of the Postmaster General, are all facts which I think the committee should take into consideration. I think it is the duty of the committee, and the right of the Senate to insist that the committee look into these questions and ascertain whether or not, on the basis of the material presented, the nomination should be reported favorably to the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri to answer a question. I do not care to have him make another 2-hour speech on the matters concerning which he has already addressed the Senate; but I should like to know whether, if the nomination is recommended to the committee, the Senator from Missouri will produce any more testimony tomorrow than he has presented today?

Mr. DONNELL. I stated earlier today that in my opinion Mr. Hannegan should be called before the committee. The committee should hear whatever statement he wishes to make. The committee should be permitted to cross-examine him. In view of the fact that Mr. Hannegan's statements, as reported in the press, do not coincide with, for example, Attorney General McKittrick, the committee should call other witnesses so that it can undertake to consider the question, not solely on the basis of the *ex parte* statement of Mr. Hannegan but also the statements of witnesses which should be presented. If the nomination is recommended to the committee I shall undertake to designate the names of several gentlemen whom I shall ask the committee to summon to Washington for the purpose of being interrogated by the committee. At the proper time I shall be glad to give to the committee the names of the gentlemen whom I have in mind.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, as I understand the situation, what the Senator from Missouri wants to do is to have the Senate go over the entire contest between himself and others who have been associated with politics in the State of Missouri, and consider the situation in connection with his election to the high office of Governor. It seems to me that unless the Senator from Missouri himself can present certain proof—and he has not done so up to the present time—with reference to charges of corruption or fraud of some kind in connection with the election, proof which goes directly to Hannegan, and unless the Senator himself can present proof, not implication or inference, which goes directly to the nomination of Hannegan for an important Cabinet position, the nomination should not be recommended to the committee. If the Senator cannot furnish any more evidence than he has furnished this afternoon, and unless the Senate

wishes to go into the field of inference and innuendo, in my humble opinion, Mr. Hannegan meets every required test which the Senator from Oregon has laid down.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I undertake to say that the newspapers published in the city of St. Louis, to which I have referred, presumably employ honorable men to report in the columns of those papers. Mr. Curtis A. Betts, of the city of St. Louis, who has been with the *Post-Dispatch* many years, has made statement after statement in the newspapers, and one man I would have before the committee would be Mr. Curtis A. Betts, of St. Louis, of the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*.

In my opinion, the matter of the selection of a Cabinet officer by the President is subject to the advice and consent of the Senate. In my judgment, the Senate should know the facts, should investigate, should have the opportunity for full and complete hearing, particularly in view of the fact that these various statements by presumably reputable newspapers have come out day after day and day after day, as well as statements of other well-known persons I have mentioned, like the chancellor of Washington University, and others. We are entitled to have witnesses before the committee who may assist it in arriving at a conclusion for itself as to the qualifications of the nominee.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask the distinguished Senator from Missouri why he did not object to Hannegan in 1942 and 1943, when the Senator was Governor of his State and when Mr. Hannegan was appointed Commissioner of Internal Revenue, an office involving people and parties and votes in his own State?

Mr. DONNELL. I will answer the Senator from Illinois by stating, first, that I was not a Member of the United States Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. No; but the Senator knew the facts.

Mr. DONNELL. There were thousands of people in the State of Missouri who knew the facts, probably knew them even more intimately, in many instances, than I did personally, who can testify before the Senate committee. There was no hearing, as a matter of fact, before the Senate committee, so far as I have discovered from the record.

Furthermore, it was not my business to come here and volunteer something in regard to that matter. Had the Senate wanted my opinion, I would have been glad to give all the facts which I had within my possession. I would have been glad to submit the names of any and all persons in Missouri who I thought could enlighten the Senate.

I do not deem it a failure on my part because, as Governor of the State, I did not intervene in the business of the Senate of the United States. I do not regard that as any reflection upon my official or personal conduct. Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. LUCAS. It answers the question to the satisfaction of the Senator from Missouri, of course, but the Senator was the great Governor of a great State, having the interests of the public at heart all the time. He knew all about Bob Hannegan at that particular hour, and he knew he was being appointed as collector of internal revenue for the district of St. Louis, in his own State, in the largest city of his State. The matter to which he has referred was fresh in his mind at that particular time, and yet as Governor of this great State he sat by silently and never uttered a protest against Hannegan; but he now comes before the Senate and wants a long-winded investigation, from now until next July, for that is what it means, involving someone, some place along the line, who does not like Hannegan. That is all I can see in it.

If the Senator is interested now in investigating Hannegan as to his qualifications for the Cabinet position of Postmaster General, he should have been interested at that particular time, and he should have been interested when there was sent to the Senate the nomination of Mr. Hannegan to be chief internal revenue officer of the United States, a position which carries greater responsibility, from the standpoint of integrity and honesty and decency than almost any other position I know of in America. I cannot understand why the Senator becomes so excited at this late hour, some 4 or 5 years after all this happened. I think I know, though.

Mr. DONNELL. I think I know, too. It is because I am a Member of the Senate of the United States, and of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. As a Senator of this great country I am entitled to know the facts, and as a member of that committee I am entitled to have the committee pass on the facts. It was not my duty as the Governor of the State of Missouri, as the Senator well knows, to neglect my duties in Missouri and come to Washington and intervene in matters here, when we had two United States Senators, Senator Clark and Senator Truman, who were well qualified and able to present matters which they thought proper to present. There was no duty resting on me as Governor, but there is a duty on me as a Senator, and I have performed it to the best of my ability, to disclose the facts so far as they are disclosed to me.

Mr. President, I am not stating that I am asking a Member of the Senate to vote against Mr. Hannegan. I am not stating that I am going to vote against him, but I do state that for the various reasons I have indicated, we are entitled to have this matter heard by the proper committee of the Senate, rather than to have a report submitted without the committee having heard the facts, without the committee investigating all these matters.

If the Senator or I were a member of the board of directors of a bank and the president appointed a man cashier, and charges of this kind were made, we would certainly investigate them. I, as a Senator, have a duty upon my shoulders at this time which I did not have on my

shoulders when I was Governor of the State of Missouri.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I can summarize my position rather quickly, because I do not care to detain the Senate. I think, however, we should keep in mind the import of the motion which is before the Senate. The motion is to recommit the nomination to the committee. It does not follow that by sending it back to the committee there necessarily will be ordered by the committee an investigation of Mr. Hannegan, but it does mean that when it is recommitted to the committee, the committee then will have the right and the duty of determining what procedure it will follow thereafter.

It may be that after this nomination is recommitted to the committee, the committee may decide against any further investigation, and report back to the Senate recommending confirmation. On the other hand, the discussion before the committee may disclose certain evidence and testimony which would cause the committee to want to investigate further, as has been suggested by the Senator from Missouri.

I wish to make very clear, as clear as I possibly can, that all I am urging is an objection to the procedure which has been followed in this case. I desire to add that I think every Cabinet nomination should be referred to a committee for full committee discussion and report. I think it should be done in defense of the President who makes the nomination. I think he should be in a position, in case anything should happen subsequent to the nomination, or being able to say that the nomination was investigated by the appropriate Senate committee, and that it was approved on the ground that the appointee met the tests to which I alluded earlier in my remarks.

The Senator from Illinois raises the question whether there is anything in the record which would support the motion. I wish to say, as one who wants to believe that Mr. Hannegan can meet these tests, that in fairness to him and in fairness to President Truman, the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads should have this matter under consideration, for the reason that despite the fact that Senators on the other side of the aisle may have the votes to confirm the nomination, I venture the suggestion that if they do, Mr. Hannegan will take his office under a cloud, when it may not be necessary that there be any cloud, if they do not agree to have the committee consider the nomination fully. I think Senators owe it to Mr. Hannegan, and I think they owe it to President Truman, to see to it that the committee considers the nomination.

I wish to conclude with the suggestion that in times so difficult as these, when we come to the question of a Cabinet appointment and the confirmation thereof by the Senate of the United States, Senators on both sides of the aisle should work together on the nomination to ascertain the facts in regard to the nominee, and submit a non-partisan report, demonstrating that the nominee meets the tests I have suggested this afternoon. If the Committee

on Post Offices and Post Roads is not given the opportunity, by recommitment, to check Mr. Hannegan's record by these tests, then I think those on the other side of the aisle open themselves up to the charge that they are not willing to have the nominee undergo the microscope of an investigation.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TAYLOR in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hickenlooper	Overton
Bankhead	Hill	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Brewster	Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb
Briggs	Kilgore	Russell
Burton	La Follette	Smith
Butler	Langer	Stewart
Chavez	Lucas	Taft
Gordon	McFarland	Taylor
Donnell	McKellar	Tunnell
Downey	McMahon	Tydings
Ellender	Millikin	Wagner
Ferguson	Mitchell	Walsh
Green	Moore	White
Hart	Morse	Wiley
Hatch	Murdoch	Willis
Hawkes	O'Daniel	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senate at this late hour to make any extended remarks in connection with this nomination. I desire to say, however, that I am happy that the Senator from Tennessee stated he had not consulted Mr. Hannegan and did not know what Mr. Hannegan's wishes might be in connection with the issue now presented to the Senate, because I personally believe that it is a disservice to Mr. Hannegan not to grant the request, which I believe to be sincerely made, by a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads to give him a chance to present to the committee his proposal that there should be a hearing on this nomination.

I am convinced that Mr. Hannegan's service as a member of the Cabinet and as Postmaster General would, in such event, start off with a much better public reaction than it will as a result of what I fear will be a strict party vote in the Senate as between Republicans and Democrats on the pending motion.

Let me say, however, that after having listened to the speech, or to most of the speech of the Senator from Missouri, if the Senate votes down the pending motion I shall support the nomination of Mr. Hannegan, because I do not believe that in his statement the Senator from Missouri has presented any probative evidence which reflects upon the character or integrity or the ability of Mr. Hannegan.

But, after all, I think in times such as these we should strive for as much unity as can be obtained in connection with the selections which the new President of the United States may make involving any changes he thinks necessary or advisable in his official family. Knowing

nothing about the details of the Missouri political situation, but knowing something about Mr. Hannegan's brief administration as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, I feel that he has, insofar as my information goes, the ability and the character to discharge the responsibilities of the high office to which he has been nominated.

I think it unfortunate that the majority leadership should have determined upon the course of denying to a member of the committee a right at a duly called meeting of the committee to present his case and thus to give the committee an opportunity to determine it. I am sorry that that course has been followed.

Mr. LANGER. As the one member of the committee who demanded a hearing at the time that the petition was circulated by the clerk of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads I wish to state that the reason why I wanted the hearing was not because of any allegations made against the honesty or the integrity or good character of Mr. Hannegan. There were none.

In order to keep the record straight on the matter of the pending confirmation, I simply wish to invite the attention of the Senate to what I said upon the Senate floor on the 13th day of May 1943. It is my conviction that a member of the Cabinet should not be chairman of any political party and that the chairman of a political party should not hold any Federal position.

What have we here? In the instant case all the 357,000 employees of the Post Office Department are under the Hatch Act and the Civil Service Act, both of which prohibit them from taking part in politics. Certainly it is inconsistent to say that no employee of the Post Office Department shall be in politics and then exempt the head of the Department—not only exempt him, but permit him to be head of a major political party, and to be in a position to scare and dictate to 357,000 employees, while if one of them answers back—if one of them objects to something the Postmaster General says—he is guilty of a violation of law and can be removed from office.

Mr. President, it has been my hope that with the new leadership provided by President Truman, the constitutional amendment which I proposed, that only one individual from any State should be appointed to the Cabinet, will be adopted. As I stated upon the floor of the Senate some time ago, we have recently had the spectacle of one-half of the entire Cabinet coming from New York State alone. Also, there is a splendid opportunity for President Truman to assume leadership in the movement calling for direct election of the President by the people. The time has come in the life of our great Republic when the electoral college should be abolished and the people themselves, by direct vote, should nominate and elect their President.

I agree with what the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has said. From what has occurred on the floor of the Senate today there is no evidence which would cause me to vote against the nomination; and the Presi-

dent should have the right to select his own Cabinet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] to recommit the nomination of Mr. Hannegan to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Legislative Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent inspecting various concentration and prison camps in Europe.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senators from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN and Mr. FULBRIGHT] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASLAND] is absent on official business for the Senate Naval Committee.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], who is absent as a delegate to the International Conference in San Francisco, has a general pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has a pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

I am advised that if present and voting the Senators whose absences have been announced would vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who is absent on official business as a delegate to the International Conference at San Francisco, has a general pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are absent on official business visiting various concentration and prison camps in Europe.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator

from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—28

Austin	Gurney	Revercomb
Ball	Hart	Shipstead
Brewster	Hawkes	Smith
Buck	Hickenlooper	Taft
Burton	La Follette	White
Butler	Langer	Wiley
Capper	Millikin	Willis
Cordon	Moore	Young
Donnell	Morse	
Ferguson	Reed	

NAYS—35

Bailey	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Johnston, S. C.	Overton
Bilbo	Kilgore	Radcliffe
Briggs	Lucas	Russell
Byrd	McFarland	Stewart
Chavez	McKellar	Taylor
Downey	McMahon	Tunnell
Ellender	Maybank	Tydings
Green	Mitchell	Wagner
Hatch	Murdoch	Walsh
Hayden	Murray	Wheeler
Hill	O'Daniel	

NOT VOTING—33

Aiken	George	Pepper
Andrews	Gerry	Robertson
Barkley	Glass	Saltonstall
Bridges	Guffey	Scrugham
Brooks	Hoey	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Okla.
Capehart	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McClellan	Tobey
Connally	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Eastland	Mead	Wherry
Fulbright	Myers	Wilson

So Mr. DONNELL's motion to recommit was rejected.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President—The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Robert E. Hannegan to be Postmaster General?

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to cast my vote. I attempted to obtain recognition before the announcement was made.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, what is the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota wishes to vote. The result has been announced.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, as a matter of fact, the Senator from North Dakota asked for the ear of the Chair before the result was announced, but he was not recognized.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from North Dakota may be permitted to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that it is impossible to obtain unanimous consent; and inasmuch as the result has been announced, it is impossible to recognize a Senator for the purpose of voting. His statement will appear in the Record.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have no objection to the Senator's vote being recorded.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the fact that I sought recognition before the result of the vote was announced, I believe I am entitled to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that the rule strictly prohibits it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, may I ask who objected?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentary informs the Chair that the rule prohibits it.

Mr. TYDINGS. I was wondering if the rule could not be waived by unanimous consent. I think the Senator is entitled to have his position stated.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope that may be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the rule.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

When the yeas and nays are ordered, the names of Senators shall be called alphabetically; and each Senator shall, without debate, declare his assent or dissent to the question, unless excused by the Senate; and no Senator shall be permitted to vote after the decision shall have been announced by the Presiding Officer, but may for sufficient reasons, with unanimous consent, change or withdraw his vote. No motion to suspend this rule shall be in order, nor shall the Presiding Officer entertain any request to suspend it by unanimous consent.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I hope unanimous consent will be granted. I believe it can be, under this situation. I myself saw the Senator from South Dakota enter the Chamber and address the Chair before the result was announced. I was about to rise to my feet to call attention to that situation, but events occurred too rapidly to enable me to have time to do so. The Senator from South Dakota did address the Chair, and I saw him do so. I saw him enter the door of the Senate Chamber and address the Chair before the result was announced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rule precludes the Chair from entertaining a motion to suspend the rule, and it cannot be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, it seems to me the present case is not one which requires unanimous consent. It is a case of a Senator who was on his feet and who addressed the Chair before the result of the vote was announced. I do not believe that the request of the Senator from South Dakota conflicts either with the spirit or the letter of the rule. If he had been seen by the Chair or if his voice had been heard, he would have been entitled to vote. The fact that he was not seen or was not heard by the Chair was no fault of his. I think the rule would be rather drastically applied if the vote of the Senator from South Dakota were not recorded.

I most respectfully suggest to the Chair that the Chair make such a ruling. I do not believe any Senator on the floor will object to it. If there is no objection, there will be no insistence on a strict application of the rule, and the Senator's vote will be allowed to be recorded.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I was about to request the floor in my own right, and then I intended to yield to the Senator from South Dakota, in order that he might explain his position, if he desired to do so. However, he has already explained his position.

I merely wish to say that I am in perfect accord with what the Senator from Maryland has said. If the Senator from South Dakota wishes to have his vote recorded, I think it should be recorded, and I hope it will be.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HATCH. I yield, if I have the floor. I had already taken my seat.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank each of the Senators who have spoken in my behalf. In view of the announced ruling of the Chair, I presume that ends the matter. I wish to say to the Chair that if I had had an opportunity to cast my vote, it would have been "yea."

In that connection I wonder whether the announcement of the vote could be withdrawn, in order to permit a Member of the Senate to cast his vote, and then have the announcement made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the pleasure of the Senate that the announcement of the vote be withdrawn and that the vote of the Senator from South Dakota be recorded? Is there objection?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I do not think I will object; but we cannot establish a precedent of permitting a Senator to vote after the announcement of the result of the vote has been made. Evidently the situation was unfortunate, namely, the Senator from South Dakota was not recognized in time to be given an opportunity to vote. The rule on this matter is about as strong and about as tight, so to speak, as one possibly could be.

If the vote of the Senator from South Dakota is recorded, it will not change the result or affect it one way or the other. The RECORD shows that the Senator is here. The RECORD shows how he would have voted if he had voted before the result was announced. I do not see how the Senator will accomplish anything now by having his vote recorded. I think the whole record is before the Senate.

I hope the Senator will not insist on having his vote recorded. He is already on record; he has recorded the fact that he was in the Chamber before the vote was announced, and that had he voted he would have voted "yea"; and had he voted, the result would not have been affected.

The rule could not be more specific or tighter than it is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to state for the benefit of the Senator from South Dakota that the clerk was exactly in line with the Chair's line of vision in the direction toward the Senator's seat when the clerk was transmitting the result of the vote to the Chair, and the Chair did not see the Senator from South Dakota and did not hear him. The Chair regrets the incident very much.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I think it would be a grievous error on the part of the Senate to avoid or evade in any way or by any subterfuge the clear intentment and the clear language of this rule of the Senate. I join in the hope that the Senator from South Dakota will not press the matter.

The circumstances of the case have been made perfectly clear, and the RECORD now shows that the Senator from South Dakota would have voted "yea" if he had had an opportunity to vote. That makes his record complete, and it makes the Senate RECORD complete.

I think it would be a great mistake on the part of the Senate to do anything which would, as I have said, either avoid or evade this rule of the Senate.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I accept the suggestion of both the acting majority leader and the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Robert E. Hannegan, of Missouri, to be Postmaster General?

Mr. HILL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent inspecting various concentration and prison camps in Europe.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MACNUSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent on official business for the Senate Naval Affairs Committee.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent as a delegate to the International Conference in San Francisco.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senators from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN and Mr. FULBRIGHT] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is unavoidably detained from the Senate.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has a general pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

I am advised that if present and voting all the Senators whose absences have been announced would vote "yea."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] who is absent on official business as a delegate to the International Conference at San Francisco, has a general

pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTENSTALL] are absent on official business, visiting various concentration and prison camps in Europe.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 2, as follows:

YEAS—60

Austin	Hart	Murray
Bailey	Hatch	O'Daniel
Ball	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Hayden	Radcliffe
Billbo	Hickenlooper	Reed
Brewster	Hill	Revercomb
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Shipstead
Burton	Kilgore	Smith
Bushfield	La Follette	Stewart
Butler	Langer	Taylor
Byrd	Lucas	Tunnell
Capper	McFarland	Tydings
Chavez	McKellar	Wagner
Cordon	McMahon	Walsh
Downey	Maybank	Wheeler
Ellender	Millikin	White
Ferguson	Mitchell	Wiley
Green	Morse	Willis
Gurney	Murdoch	Young

NAYS—2

Donnell Taft

NOT VOTING—34

Aiken	Glass	Robertson
Andrews	Guffey	Saltonstall
Barkley	Hoey	Scruggam
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capehart	McClidlan	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	Magnuson	Tobey
Connally	Mead	Vandenberg
Eastland	Moore	Wherry
Fulbright	Myers	Wilson
George	Overton	
Gerry	Pepper	

So the nomination of Robert E. Hannegan, of Missouri, to be Postmaster General was confirmed.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to make a statement for the RECORD in regard to my vote in the Hannegan case. I wish to make it very clear that in my judgment a prima facie showing was made which called upon the proponents of the nomination to give the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads an opportunity to consider further the procedure which should have been followed in a final consideration of the case. As I think I made clear in my remarks, my objection was to the procedure which was followed by the committee and by its chairman, which I think set an exceptionally bad precedent, and one which I hope will not be repeated.

I thought further that in fairness to Mr. Hannegan and in fairness to President Truman the matter should have gone to the committee for further discussion of the procedure. I sincerely felt that in fairness to the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DON-

NELL], who simply asked for the courtesy of having further discussion of this matter in the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, of which he is a member, the Senate owed him that courtesy of further discussion before the committee. But as I said in my remarks, from a thorough study of the history of Cabinet confirmations and rejections I did not feel that there was before us sufficient evidence to overcome the presumption which is due the President of the United States, be he Democratic or Republican, to pick his official family and have the members thereof confirmed, unless a clear showing is made that they are not deserving of confirmation under the tests which I enumerated in my discussion. On the basis of the evidence before me at the time I cast the vote I could not say that the presumption had been overcome. I think it is most unfair, however, to both the President and to the Postmaster General that the matter was not considered further by the committee so as to have cleared the atmosphere of any charges as to his qualifications under those tests.

POSTMASTER AT HOPKINS, MINN.—
NOMINATION PASSED OVER

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I understand that a postmaster nomination reported last Monday was temporarily passed over. After conferring with the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] I understand that the Senator from Minnesota will make a statement, and then we shall be able to dispose of the nomination within a few minutes.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] wishes to make a statement, and I yield to him.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I shall state the facts in connection with this postmastership. Mr. Kosanda, whose nomination has been reported to the Senate, was appointed acting postmaster a little more than a year ago. A competitive civil-service examination was held and three successful candidates were certified by the Civil Service Commission as follows: Roy M. Kelly with a grade of 91.8, Einar Jorgenson with a grade of 84.6, and Thomas J. Kosanda, whose name is before the Senate, with a grade of 75.8.

The Civil Service Commission ruled that all three men were entitled to veterans' preference, and all three have had 5 percent added to their grades.

Mr. Kelley, who was at the top of the list of the three eligibles, is a World War veteran who served overseas in the First World War for 13 months. He worked in the Hopkins, Minn., post office for 18 years, the past several years as assistant postmaster. Obviously, on the basis of his grade he is the best qualified man for the position.

Kosanda, whom the Civil Service Commission ruled was entitled to veterans' preference, was drafted on November 11, 1918, and was discharged on December 10, 1918, without ever having actually been sworn into the Army of the United States.

The Civil Service Commission made its ruling under a decision of the Su-

preme Court of the District of Columbia in 1931 which held that any individual drafted into the armed forces thereby became a veteran entitled to a veteran's preference. But since that decision the Seventy-eighth Congress passed Public Law No. 359 approved on June 27, 1944. That law provides that with respect to appointments under the Civil Service veterans shall be given preference in three classes; the first three dealing with disabled veterans, their widows, and dependents, and the fourth dealing with ex-service men and women who have served on active duty in any branch of the armed forces of the United States during any war, or in any campaign or expedition for which a campaign badge has been authorized, and from which service the person was discharged under honorable conditions. I think the Civil Service certification of Kosanda as a veteran is directly contrary to the language of the statute passed last year by the Congress, which provides that in order to be eligible for a veteran's preference a person must have served in active duty in the armed forces. I may say that the adjutant general of Minnesota has no record of Kosanda ever having been a war veteran.

I do not personally know any of these men and have no interest in the matter except that I have received protests and resolutions adopted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars post in Hopkins, Minn. I believe at the present time that veterans of the present war who have suffered wounds in combat, and are being discharged at the rate of several thousand a month, are involved in the situation, and that a serious question is also involved of whether we intend really to apply veterans' preference in this instance, or permit this kind of a run-around in connection with a real veteran. I hope the Senate will not confirm this appointment, and that the real veteran, who has served for 18 years in the post office at Hopkins, and who was overseas in military service for 13 months, be appointed to the position of postmaster at Hopkins, Minn.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, all I can say is that the Civil Service Commission has said that these men have Army classification. They were given a rating by the Civil Service Commission on the basis of having been soldiers.

I do not know anything in the world about Mr. Kosanda except from hearsay, but he has been acting as postmaster for a year or two, and I believe the other gentleman is in the Post Office Department there in the same town. He wishes to supersede the present acting postmaster. Under those circumstances there is nothing that the committee could do, or that I could personally do. Much as I like the senior Senator and the junior Senator from Minnesota, I am confronted with the belief that probably this is another political matter. I hope that the Senate will confirm the nomination.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I understood my colleague to state that the nominee had been appointed contrary to law. Was I correct in my understanding?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; he was not appointed contrary to law.

Mr. BALL. My position is that the Civil Service Commission acted on a Supreme Court of the District of Columbia decision of 1931 which, I believe, has been superseded by the veterans' preference law passed by Congress last year, and which applies only to veterans who have seen active duty. Obviously, Kosanda was never on active duty. He reported for induction on November 11, 1918, apparently was sent to Camp Ripley, remained there until December 10, 1918, and then was discharged.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Is it the contention of the junior Senator from Minnesota that Kosando is not eligible for the position of postmaster at Hopkins, Minn.?

Mr. BALL. I do not believe he is eligible under the present law governing veterans' preference. I think the Civil Service Commission was in error in certifying that he was entitled to veteran's preference.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. If that be true, he was certified illegally, was he not?

Mr. BALL. He is not certified here illegally, because the Post Office Department is required by law to rely on the certification of the Civil Service Commission. The only place to get it changed now, if the Civil Service Commission is in error, as I contend it is, is here in the Senate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] wishes to speak this afternoon. I had hoped we might dispose of the pending nomination very shortly, but I am not sure that can be done. Will the distinguished Senator from Minnesota be here Thursday?

Mr. BALL. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Will it be agreeable to the Senator to let this nomination go over? I do not believe we can finish it now. It is nearly 6 o'clock, and other Senators are very anxious to address the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. BALL. On this matter?

Mr. HILL. No. I will move that the Senate go into legislative session, and as soon as we go back into executive session, this nomination will be the pending question.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Civil Service, I am very much interested in the issue presented here, and I should like to have an opportunity to make some investigation. I am wondering if we cannot agree to put this nomination over at least 1 week so that opportunity may be afforded for an investigation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], who does not seem to be in the Chamber at the moment, is very much interested in the nomination. I have no objection to it going over for a week. It has been before the committee for a long time, and I hope it can be disposed of at the end of the week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California that the nomination be laid over for 1 week? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be noti-

fied forthwith of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the President will be immediately notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of legislative business.

HOSPITAL CENTER FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, recently the Senate passed by unanimous vote Senate bill 223, providing for a hospital center for the District of Columbia, whereupon a motion was made by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed. By agreement the motion to reconsider was to be taken up today, but, because of the time consumed in other matters, we find it is too late to take it up now. We have reached another agreement, that the motion may be called up Thursday, with the consent of the Senator from Louisiana, and we have agreed on an hour for each side so that it may be disposed of as early as possible. I ask unanimous consent that that order be approved.

Mr. WHITE. What is the agreement which has been entered into between the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. BILBO. We agreed, and we are asking the Senate to confirm the agreement, that we may have time on Thursday to dispose of this motion. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is very much interested, and he cannot be present any other day but Thursday. He has joined in the request that we be permitted to call the motion up and dispose of it, with not to exceed an hour a side on the issue.

Mr. WHITE. I know nothing about the merits of the matter, and I have no objection to it being taken up Thursday, but I would not care to agree at this time, with so few Senators present as there are now, to a limitation of time for debate. I have no objection to the motion being taken up Thursday.

Mr. BILBO. Can I get unanimous consent to make the motion the unfinished business for Thursday?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I suggest that instead of making it the unfinished business for Thursday, we make it the pending business before the Senate now, and of course with the understanding that we will not debate it now. We are to have a speech by the Senator from Louisiana. We can make it the pending business now, since there is no business before the Senate, and when we meet Thursday, after a recess, it will be the business before the Senate.

Mr. BILBO. I also wish to suggest that it is agreed between us, I am authorized to say, that it will not take more than 80 minutes that is, 40 minutes to each side.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator may be able to speak for himself and the Senator from Louisiana, and give assurance to the Senate that they will not take more

than 80 minutes, but I question whether he could give any assurance about the other Senators.

Mr. BILBO. We could get unanimous consent, and that would bind us and the rest of the Senate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask that the motion of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 223, for the construction of a modern, adequate, and efficient hospital center in the District of Columbia, may be made the pending business of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROMOTION OF OFFICERS IN THE MEDICAL, DENTAL, AND VETERINARY CORPS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 939, Calendar No. 234, and I promise that if there is any discussion or any controversy whatever I shall withdraw the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 939) to extend the provisions of the act of November 29, 1940 (Public Law 834, 76th Cong., 54 Stat. 1219), relating to promotion of Medical, Dental, and Veterinary Corps officers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado was good enough to call this measure to my attention, and I have taken the opportunity to consult with minority members of the Committee on Military Affairs, so far as I could do so. I understand that there is no objection to the bill in its amended form.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not know of any controversy over the bill whatsoever, and I hope it may be passed at this time, because it is more or less of an emergency matter. I may say the bill provides an extension of a previous act which has been in effect for 5 years, and the time will expire on May 15, 1945. This was overlooked, and it is necessary to have this bill passed before May 15.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That" to strike out "for the duration" and to insert "until the termination," on line 4, after the word "engaged" to insert a comma and the words, "as declared by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of the Congress," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That until the termination of the wars in which the United States is presently engaged, as declared by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of the Congress, and for 6 months thereafter, the Secretary of War may, in his discretion, dispense with

any part of the examination for promotion in the Regular Army of officers of the Medical, Dental, and Veterinary Corps, except those relating to physical examination.

SEC. 2. This act shall become effective as of May 15, 1945.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I should like to have inserted in the RECORD at this point an explanation of the bill, together with the report from the Senate Committee on Military Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement and report (No. 237) were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

STATEMENT AS TO SENATE BILL 939

Under the provisions of section 24c of the National Defense Act, as amended, and the act of July 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 505, 506), officers of the Medical, Dental, and Veterinary Corps are required to pass a professional examination for promotion in the Regular Army. However, by virtue of the provisions of the act of November 29, 1940 (54 Stat. 1219), the Secretary of War is authorized, in his discretion, until May 15, 1945, to dispense with any part of the examination for promotion in the Regular Army of officers of the Medical, Dental, and Veterinary Corps, except those parts relating to physical examinations. The purpose of S. 939, as recommended by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, is to extend such authority until the termination of the wars in which the United States is presently engaged, as declared by proclamation of the President or by a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of the Congress, and for 6 months thereafter.

Although in peacetime the requirement of professional examinations in connection with the promotions of Medical, Dental, and Veterinary Corps officers in the Regular Army offers no great difficulty, the situation is quite different in time of war. The assembling of examining boards throughout the Army for this purpose entails the employment of three officers for each board. This would involve an unjustifiable expenditure of the time and energy of such officers when their services are directly needed in connection with their professional duties. Furthermore, the activities performed by officers of the Medical Department in time of war are such as to furnish reliable criteria of their abilities without the need for academic examinations. If the requirement of professional examinations remains discretionary with the Secretary of War, he would be free to require that they be given when conditions permit and could dispense with them when they interfere with the prosecution of the work of the Medical Department.

REPORT TO ACCOMPANY S. 939

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 939) to extend the provisions of the act of November 29, 1940 (Public Law 884, 76th Cong., 54 Stat. 1219), relating to promotion of Medical, Dental, and Veterinary Corps officers, having considered the same, submit the following report thereon, with the recommendation that it do pass with certain amendments.

AMENDMENTS

In line 3, after the word "That", delete the words "for the duration" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "until the termination".

In line 4, after the word "engaged", insert a comma and the following: "as declared by

proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of the Congress."

The purpose of the amendments is to clarify the date on which the provisions of the bill will cease to be effective.

STATEMENT

The act of November 29, 1940 (54 Stat. 1219), authorizes the Secretary of War, in his discretion, to dispense with any part of the examination for promotion in the Regular Army of officers of the Medical, Dental, and Veterinary Corps, except those parts relating to physical examinations. Under the provisions of that act, this authority terminates on May 15, 1945.

The purpose of the bill, as recommended by your committee, is to extend such authority until the termination of the wars in which the United States is presently engaged, as declared by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of the Congress, and for 6 months thereafter.

Your committee believe that in wartime the requirement of professional examinations for promotion of officers of the Medical, Dental, and Veterinary Corps in the Regular Army should be discretionary with the Secretary of War. The assembling of examining boards throughout the Army for this purpose entails the employment of three officers for each board. This would involve an unjustifiable expenditure of the time and energy of such officers when their services are needed urgently in rendering professional care to our sick and wounded soldiers. Moreover, the activities performed by officers of the Medical Department in time of war are such as to furnish reliable criteria of their abilities without the need of academic examinations.

War Department witnesses appeared and testified in support of the measure.

CONSTRUCTION OF AIRPORT SYSTEM

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from the Governor of the State of Minnesota, in the form of a petition for coordination between the Federal Government and the various States in the postwar aviation and airport program.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. PAUL, MINN., May 3, 1945.

Senator HENRIK SHIPSTEAD,
United States Senate:

Minnesota 1945 Legislature enacted sound aviation program which we hope can be coordinated with Federal program along same pattern used in development of State highways. Since the municipalities and the State will make a substantial investment, we believe nothing in Federal bill should deprive the State or its municipalities of their rightful authority over these installations after they have been constructed, and that fullest provision should be made for intergovernmental cooperation in planning, construction, maintenance, and operation of State and National airport systems.

EDWARD J. THYE,
Governor of Minnesota.

COMPULSORY LABOR DRAFT—LETTER AND STATEMENT BY AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a copy of a letter which I have received from Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, with respect to the so-called manpower bill. In connection with the letter I ask unanimous con-

sent that there may be printed also in the body of the RECORD a press release issued by the American Federation of Labor on the same subject.

There being no objection, the letter and the release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 27, 1945.

JOSEPH O'MAHONEY,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows that the conference report on H. R. 1752, classified as the compulsory labor draft bill, which the Senate most decisively rejected on April 3 was returned to the House Military Affairs Committee on April 23. Does this mean the end of legislative procedure regarding this legislation and the definite defeat of same.

Be assured that the officers and members of the American Federation of Labor are very deeply appreciative of the aggressive and successful fight which you made against the adoption of this form of compulsory service legislation. It seems so contradictory on the part of those who sponsored this legislation to seek its enactment into law at a time when the defeat of Hitler was imminent and our own country was face to face with a cutback situation in war material production plants which would lead to varying degrees of unemployment.

Labor has made a wonderful record during the war, not only in the maintenance of its no-strike pledge, but in the production of snips, planes, guns, tanks, and war material of all kinds. Labor will not falter or fail even to the slightest degree. It will continue to give its skill, training, and service in the future as it has in the past and will maintain the high standard of production and excellency of service which it has set all during the war until our enemies are defeated both in Europe and in the South Pacific.

Very sincerely yours,

WILLIAM GREEN,

President, American Federation of Labor.

STATEMENT BY THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR, APRIL 30, 1943

Events again have proved the wisdom of the American Federation of Labor's unflinching and unalterable opposition to the enactment of compulsory manpower legislation.

The defeat of this legislation in Congress has not injured the war-production program. On the contrary, production records were broken and schedules exceeded in the month of March, according to official announcement.

Nor has the absence of compulsory labor controls resulted in more manpower shortages, as many official authorities predicted. The opposite is true. In recent weeks, several cities have been taken off the critical list and manpower needs are being met in every important war industry.

Finally, and most important of all, voluntary labor in America has succeeded in backing up the victory drive on the fighting fronts with amazing success. Our armed forces have not lacked materials or equipment. In fact, the overwhelming superiority of their equipment has proved the decisive factor in winning the war in Europe and in turning the tide against Japan.

Today we hear no more talk of the need of forced labor.

Already the War Department has made substantial cut-backs in airplane production. One of the largest factories in the Nation which formerly operated around the clock is going back to one-shift, 40-hour-week schedules. Shipyards are not getting any new orders and the Maritime Commission is planning to wind up most of its ship-

building program by the end of the year. The end of the war in Europe means that the war-production program generally will be cut in half within a few months.

Under these circumstances it is imperative that a large-scale reconversion program be undertaken at once. American industry must be given enough advance notice of cancellation of war contracts so that it can proceed without unnecessary delay to put into effect plans for peacetime production which will provide jobs for displaced war workers and returning servicemen. Unless the reconversion process is expedited, mass unemployment will grip America in 1945 and purchasing power will be reduced to such a low point that expansion of postwar production will be blocked.

Immediate action is also required by Congress and by Federal agencies to protect human needs during the reconversion period. President Truman, while serving as a Senator during the last session of Congress, sponsored reconversion legislation which provided far more adequate unemployment compensation to disemployed workers than is available at present. This measure was defeated, but the executive council feels that it should be revived at this time and that it would be most fitting for the President to recommend it to Congress.

Production cut-backs are bound to eliminate the overtime pay on which most workers have relied during the past 2 years to offset increased living costs. The National War Labor Board must take cognizance of this critical situation and order immediate revision of the Little Steel formula, so that frozen wage rates can be adjusted to make up for the loss of overtime pay. The executive council will deal with the subject of wage rates in more detail during the next few days, but it takes this opportunity to warn the National War Labor Board that further delay will be dangerous to the Nation's postwar economy.

THE CONTRIBUTION OF PRICE CONTROL TO THE SUCCESS OF THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I dislike to detain the Senate at this late hour, but I can assure Senators that what I have to say will not require more than 15 minutes. It is on a very important subject, and I hope that all Senators who are present will listen.

As the war in Europe draws to an end and as the Allied armies and navies are getting set for the final phase of the war, it is time to take stock of the contributions of price control to the success of the war effort and to stake out the problems that lie ahead.

Wartime price control is a most unpleasant undertaking. It is a most vexing problem, not only to those who have to administer it but also to the people who have to be administered under it. It is something which we undertake for very compelling reasons.

Among the compelling reasons or purposes behind price control are these:

First, to facilitate speedy and increased war production by assuring our producers stable and predictable materials costs—without which orderly scheduling of production contracts becomes impossible.

Second, to maintain wartime morale, particularly among wage earners, who cannot continue putting their shoulders to the wheel when the cost of living moves away from them and they have to engage in a losing race between price increases and wage adjustments.

Third, to prevent the dissipation of Government war expenditures by adding to the gigantic unavoidable costs of total war the inexcusable burden of inflated prices.

Fourth—and this some would call the most important of all—to preserve a sound economy for our heroes to come back to, instead of an economy ruined by the twin evils of runaway inflation and deflationary collapse.

Now let us see what has been the record of price control, the record of the O. P. A. in achieving these purposes. Our war production record as a whole, despite mistakes of detail in one field or another, has been unbelievably superb. Everybody here at home, and both our friends and our enemies abroad, acknowledge this. Of course, nobody has any pretension of attributing this record solely, or even in major part, to the success of price control. It is the product of many factors—the genius and drive of American enterprise, the hard work and skill of our millions of war workers, the scheduling and production controls laid out by the War Production Board and the armed services, and so forth. But this much we can say, and that is that the O. P. A. made its contribution to the total record, and made it well.

Let us look at the figures of industrial production and prices during the two wars.

I have here a table in which these figures are set forth. Taking production in 1914, the year that World War No. 1 began, as 100, they show a rise to 126 in 1917 and a slight decline, to 125 in 1918, and the year that World War No. 1 ended. Think of that, Mr. President. In the last war our industrial production peak was reached before we really got into the war, and output actually slackened off while we fought. Yet it was not tight pricing that held back production. Far from it. Between 1914 and 1918 the wholesale prices of industrial goods increased 83 percent, and by the time of the Armistice they were just about double their July 1914 level. There was a doubling of prices but only a 25 percent increase of production. The table shows the following figures:

Industrial prices and production

WORLD WAR NO. 1

Year	Prices	Production
1914.....	100	100
1915.....	102	114
1916.....	133	121
1917.....	172	129
1918.....	168	125

WORLD WAR NO. 2

1939.....	100	100
1940.....	102	115
1941.....	109	143
1942.....	117	183
1943.....	119	219
1944.....	121	216

Sources: Prices (wholesale, all commodities other than foods and farm products), Bureau of Labor Statistics. Production: World War No. 1, F. C. Mills, Economic Tendencies in the United States, World War No. 2, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

How different is our record in this war. According to the table before me, industrial production has for 2 years now run

at more than double the 1939 level, while industrial prices have risen less than 25 percent. The pattern of the last war has been just reversed as our energies have been concentrated on production under the benefits of stable prices and stable costs. There has been no speculation in essential commodities, no hoarding or withholding of such materials from war production. And under stabilization, there has been mighty little work stoppage for shortage of materials, wage disputes, or any other factor.

This production record belongs to us all and, of course, it belongs primarily to the men in the factories, American men of management and labor. But I think it clear from these contrasting records of our two war-production experiences that a share in this superb achievement must go to price control and the agency which has been responsible for price control.

In agricultural production, the contribution of the O. P. A. is equally clear. During World War No. 1, the physical volume of our agricultural production rose only 6 percent during the entire 4 years. Rising farm prices stimulated agricultural production at the outset, but toward the end of the conflict the rise was stopped. An important factor in this was the rise of farm costs. Without price control, these costs overtook and exceeded the rise in farm prices, and the farmer's economic position grew steadily worse.

This time the Nation, through the policies set by the various price-control acts, has sought and has succeeded, first, in restoring farm prices to a proper balance with industrial prices and, next, in restraining such prices from rising beyond the level of balance. Restoration of this balance has entailed the effective control of the prices paid by farmers and, thus, of their most important costs. In consequence of this control the farmers' gains this time have been real, not illusory. It is no accident, I think, that during these years wartime agricultural production has broken all records and has expanded more than four times as much, percentage-wise, as it did during the last war.

At this point, Mr. President, I wish to read a speech delivered by me on the America's Town Meeting of the Air program on April 12, 1945, in the city of New Orleans. The title was "Is the Present Food Shortage Necessary?"

The speech reads as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, asking the question "Is the present food shortage necessary?" reminds me of the case of the man brought into court because his dog was charged with biting another man.

He appeared without benefit of counsel, and the judge asked what he had to say in his own defense.

"Well, judge," he replied, "in the first place, no one has proven that this man was bitten by a dog."

"In the second place, if he was bitten by a dog, no one had proved that it was my dog that bit him."

"In the third place, I don't have a dog!"

Now, all of this talk about whether the present food shortage is necessary reminds me of that man. Before we set about proving whether a food shortage is necessary, we ought to determine whether there is a food shortage in the first place.

For more than 3 years, as a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, I have heard much testimony predicting a famine of certain farm commodities. These famines have not occurred, but on the contrary, our food production in 1944 exceeded prewar levels by one-third.

Meat production, for instance, in 1945 will be 33 percent above the average for the years 1935-39; with beef 36 percent above and pork 43. Estimates for the following commodities covering the same period are as follows: 43 percent increase in chickens, 36 in eggs, 15 in milk, and 52 in cheese. Fruits and vegetables, both fresh and processed, will be up 6 to 46 percent. Wheat is up 23 percent, corn 33, and oats 24.

This enormous food production could not have been made possible except for the fortitude and the patriotism of our unsung, uncited soldiers of the soil, our farmers. They are cultivating every available acre in our land, often with insufficient tools and implements, and with 6,000,000 less farmers.

Now, what becomes of this enormous supply during wartime? Before the war almost 98 percent was consumed by civilians and the rest was commercially exported. Last year almost 80 percent of our huge supply was consumed by our civilian population, over 13 percent by our military forces, nearly 6 percent for lend-lease, and slightly over 1 percent for exports. This year, depending upon the rapidity with which we can conquer our enemies, we can expect our civilian supply to dwindle further, for the simple reason that victory brings on the added responsibility of feeding prisoners of war and aiding the inhabitants of conquered territory.

Our most vexing problem is that of distribution. Our civilian population now has money to spend. It has money to spend and is ready to buy what it wants. Some sections of our country are highly industrialized and others are primarily agricultural. For a balanced economy we must move the products of industry and the products of agriculture where they are needed.

As an illustration let's use the meat situation. It must be remembered that no meat can be shipped from one State into another unless it is federally inspected. All meat supplies for our armed forces and our allies must be federally inspected. A lot of meat on the hoof does not mean a lot of meat in Washington, New York, and the State of Rhode Island, which are located away from our meat-producing areas. Federally inspected plants will slaughter about 15,800,000,000 pounds of meat in 1945. Civilian consumers will get 10,400,000,000 pounds in 1945. In prewar days civilians consumed 10,600,000,000 pounds.

When there is ample money available for people to buy what they want, commodities do not move far out from the producing areas. The tendency is toward local slaughtering and selling, and I know that such a situation tends further to aggravate distribution.

Rationing causes a more even distribution. When meat supplies concentrate near producing centers and do not reach all consumers, we must widen its distribution by increasing ration-point values. We should have ration points high enough to move the existing normal meat supply out over the entire country, so the total supply will be distributed fairly. When that is done, we will all be consuming, on the average, about the same amount of meat that we could have purchased in normal times.

If we stop the leaks, curb the black markets, buy at ceiling prices, and pay ration points, we shall have food enough. If we observe the rules and each of us acts as a self-appointed sentinel no one of us will go hungry.

Mr. President, on the morale side of the war effort, we have the O. P. A.'s contribution to the economic stabilization program, and here the record is crystal clear. It has been O. P. A.'s job to hold the cost of living, so that wage stabilization could be maintained, so that labor could adhere to its voluntary no-strike pledge, and so that all classes could contribute their share to the war effort without the sinking fear that the bottom had dropped out of the dollar and the purchasing power of money had disappeared.

Mr. President, I believe we should all be proud of the fact that a dollar is still a dollar in the United States. Yes, I know that the cost of living has risen by something like 25 percent since 1941. But the fact of the matter is that today the price level is just about where it was in 1928 and 1929. In those years, we did not say that money had lost its value and that the dollar had ceased to be a dollar. And we cannot say that today.

What is more, although we have been unable to prevent a moderate wartime increase in the cost of living, the O. P. A. during the past 2 years has not only checked the rise, but it has kept the over-all average of cost-of-living prices practically stationary. Since May 1943, just before the "hold the line" program was launched, the cost of living has risen by approximately 1½ percent.

I have here a second table in which the steady improvement in the control of prices with each successive stage of the stabilization program is dramatically brought out. I wonder, Mr. President, how many Senators are aware that since May 1943, the cost of living has risen less than six one-hundredths of 1 percent a month, as compared with a rise of nearly 1 percent a month during the 16 months preceding the establishment of general price control. The table is as follows:

Percentage increase in cost of living and wholesale prices during selected periods

	Percentage increase in—			
	Cost of living		Wholesale prices	
	Total	Per month	Total	Per month
August 1939 ¹ to May 1942, 33 months.....	17.6	0.53	31.7	0.96
January 1941 ² to May 1942, 16 months.....	15.1	.94	22.3	1.39
May 1942 to May 1943, ³ 12 months.....	7.8	.65	5.4	.45
May 1943 to March 1945, ⁴ 22 months.....	1.4	.06	1.2	.05

¹ Last month before outbreak of war in Europe.

² Month in which general maximum price regulation became effective.

³ Base month of Little Steel formula.

⁴ Month preceding launching of price program under the "hold the line" order.

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

With so much money in circulation, there is little doubt that many people are paying illegal prices and that some of these illegal prices may not be reflected in the cost of living index, although the Bureau of Labor Statistics prides itself on getting actual prices, not merely the legal ceiling prices, in

charting the changes in the cost of living. But making all allowances that we will the record in holding the line against inflation is a remarkably good one, and we all ought to recognize this and give credit where credit is due.

The other day an item in Leonard Lyons' syndicated column struck my eye and made me stop and think about our record on inflation control. The item described how Leon Henderson, former O. P. A. Administrator, went to China to give expert advice to the Chinese Government on how to handle the Chinese inflation problem. While in Chungking Mr. Henderson heard he could buy silk stockings, and he searched around for a pair. He was finally offered a pair of rayons for \$32 in American money. The price in Chinese money was not stated, but it probably would have required a truckload of currency to negotiate the transaction. When Mr. Henderson examined them, he found them marked with this label: "O. P. A. Ceiling Price, 95 cents."

The ratio between 95 cents and \$32 measures our relative success in controlling wartime inflation. It measures the difference between a country where money has value and a dollar is still a dollar, and a country where currency has become a cheap form of wallpaper.

In our own country we had something like the Chinese experience of runaway inflation. We had it at the time of the War of the Revolution, and from that time dates the expression, "not worth a continental." Our history books tell us how seriously Washington's struggle to carry on the war was handicapped by the inflation of prices and the depreciation of the paper of the Continental Congress. Our history books also tell us how, when the Constitution was established, our young Republic had to pay off the inflated costs of the war in hard taxes and real money. That brings me to the record that has been achieved by the O. P. A. in preventing the dissipation of our war appropriations and war expenditures through inflated prices.

We do not have to compare the record of the O. P. A. in holding down war expenditures with such extreme cases as the inflation in China or the inflation during our War of the Revolution. All we need to do is to compare the record in this war with the record in World War No. 1. It has been estimated that if we had been no more successful in holding down prices in this war than was the case in the last war, the extra cost of this war to the Government—and that means to you and me and to all other taxpayers—would have amounted to \$80,000,000,000 up to the end of 1944. Even in these days of astronomical sums, that is not pin money.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a table showing the comparative increases in prices over 4 years of two World Wars, which was made a part of a speech delivered by me before this body on November 29, 1943.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparative price increases over 4 year of 2 world wars

	1914-18 World War No. 1 (percent price increase) ¹	1939-43 World War No. 2 (percent price increase) ²
Cost of living, total ³	50.3	24.9
Food (61 items).....	63.9	46.7
Clothing (111 items).....	85.3	28.5
Household furnishings (39 items).....	77.2	24.8
Wholesale prices, total (889 items).....	96.1	37.5
Raw materials (111 items).....	102.1	69.5
Semimanufactures (99 items).....	131.3	24.7
Finished products (679 items).....	87.6	26.0
Industrial commodities ⁴ (709 items).....	12.4	21.2
Selected manufactured items:		
Steel plates (tank).....	187.4	0
Copper ingots.....	90.3	14.0
Plate glass.....	76.1	0
Wool blankets.....	164.7	50.0
Cotton hosiery (men's).....	132.3	71.9
Blue denim.....	214.8	74.5
Prices received by farmers for all commodities.....	91	119
Prices received by farmers for 58 foods.....	78	116
Selected agricultural items:		
Cattle.....	58	89
Hogs.....	102	150
Cotton.....	127	128
Milk.....	46	94
Butter fat.....	73	122
Wheat.....	165	133
Corn.....	106	139
Prices paid by farmers for 174 commodities and for interest and taxes.....	71	24

¹ July 1914 to July 1918.² August 1939 to August 1943.³ Rent and fuel, not available by months.⁴ All commodities other than farm products and foods.⁵ To May 1943, the latest available.⁶ 1914 to 1918, not available for World War No. 1 period.

Source: Farm prices, Bureau of Agricultural Economics; others, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as we look forward to the future, it is not the saving in money costs of the war that should be uppermost in our minds, but the preservation of a sound economy for the postwar period. On this, as I have already stated, our record so far has been remarkably good. But, unfortunately, this is a problem on which we cannot merely stand on our record. We must see the thing through to the end, or all the good that we have accomplished so far with so much strain and effort will be lost.

We must see the job of price control through to the end; and the end means not merely the end of the war in Europe, not merely the end of all fighting in the Pacific, but the end of all inflationary threats, and the end of all the war-developed scarcities.

That is the critical test which we face from now on. It is a critical test because the dramatic tie-up between price control and the success of the military effort tends to disappear, and because the feeling is spreading among many people that the need for price control is about over.

This is the moment which has been chosen by various pressure groups to exploit the weak and soft spots in the price-control program for the purpose of wrecking our whole apparatus of controls.

Mr. President, I have no desire to gloss over the black market in meat or the black market in any commodity. It is a serious threat to the continued effective-

ness of price control. We must pitch in with all constructive efforts to curb it. I believe that Mr. Bowles' new 10-point meat program is a long step in that direction, but I am ready to support even more drastic and more stringent programs if they prove necessary. But frankly, what alarms me in much of the testimony, and in some of the proposals made as a result of congressional food investigations, is the doctrine that the way to eliminate black markets is to raise prices all down the line. If we do that for meat, we shall have to do the same for all other industrial groups. There is not a single industry, no matter how prosperous a showing it makes on its income-tax statements, that does not complain that it is being pinched by price control.

During the height of the war struggle, the Congress recognized that we could not set price ceilings in the way that tariff rates were set in the old days, namely, by logrolling of pressure groups. Today, however, that idea finds favor. Why? It seems to me it is because the basic public awareness of the danger of inflation has lessened. There has been a let-down in the public pressure that has kept pressure groups in check.

That is the most alarming aspect of the whole situation. It is incumbent on all Members of the Congress to combat the trend of apathy and indifference to the inflation problem. Let us recall what happened after the last war. About 40 percent of the total inflation of the last war took place after the Armistice, after the fighting had stopped, after we removed price controls. Prices went up fast in 1919, but in the ensuing crash of 1920 and 1921 they came down even faster, and they came down hard. From the peak inflated levels, wholesale prices dropped 45 percent in 20 months, and farm prices more than 50 percent in only 13 months. Factory pay rolls shrank 44 percent, and unemployment increased by five and one-half million. Peak corporation profits turned into losses, and business failures rose 40 percent above pre-war rates. Farmers' incomes were cut by two-thirds, and nearly half a million farm owners lost their farms by foreclosure during the next 5 years.

Unless we watch carefully, that is what will happen again. That is why I agreed with the statement of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. Taft) at a recent hearing that "price control must be continued after the war." Not only must price control be continued, but there must be no let-down in its enforcement, and there must be no let-down in the vigor with which we hold the line.

It is always the last lap of the race, the last round of the fight that determines the outcome. We are coming up now for the last round in the stabilization fight. When the American people realize this—and I am sure they will—they will not quit on this round. They will put on the same whirlwind finish on the home front that our boys are putting on in the war fronts of Europe and the Pacific.

RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, May 10, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 7 (legislative day of April 16), 1945:

FOREIGN SERVICE

Spruille Braden to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Argentina.

Edward A. Dow, Jr., to be a consul of the United States of America.

Laurence C. Frank to be a Foreign Service officer of class 4, a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, and a consul general of the United States of America.

POSTMASTER GENERAL

Robert E. Hannegan to be Postmaster General, effective July 1, 1945.

IN THE ARMY

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

(The nominations of James Hart Hottenroth and others for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, which were received by the Senate on April 30, 1945, which appear in full at the end of the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning on p. 3946 and ending on p. 3949 with the name of George Jefferson McMurtry.)

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Martin A. Gassner, Alexander.

CALIFORNIA

Floyd V. Wike, Bryte.
Logan P. White, Lancaster.
Thomas S. Powell, Orosi.
Robert A. Bates, Roseville.
Elsie R. Wiseman, Standard.
Bonnie F. Rodenbaugh, Winterhaven.
Maxwell F. Buffum, Yreka.

IDAHO

Maye Burns, Osburn.

INDIANA

Eva A. Thompson, Chesterfield.
Ferd B. Koenig, Etna Green.
James W. Shafar, Frankfort.
Leslie C. Weigle, Fremont.
Nellie K. Kownover, Granger.
Bernard H. McCann, Lawrenceburg.
Fred M. Hoppas, Sidney.

KENTUCKY

Glenn F. Hozendorf, Coral Ridge.

LOUISIANA

Charles A. Batton, Dubberly.
Louis A. Dubreuil, Marrero.
Robert W. Human, Sulphur.
Roy M. Taylor, Winnaboro.

MAINE

Ida M. Packard, Bethel.
Evariste A. Chenard, Chisholm.
Margaret I. Colby, Coopers Mills.

MINNESOTA

Alice Lucille Wood, Cass Lake.
Shirley M. Anderson, Evan.
Mildred A. Olson, Harris.
Jay P. Mortenson, Lyle.

MISSOURI

Geraldine T. Johnson, Ash Grove.
Raymond Nickles, Fair Play.
Roy F. Irvin, Festus.
Ruth J. Tate, Grain Valley.
Cordie Opal Price, Green Castle.
Jesse J. Ayer, Lancaster.
David M. Weems, Neosho.
Hazel A. Pollock, Powersville.
Hubert B. Brown, Slater.

NEVADA

Nettie W. Wills, Goldfield.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Raymond L. Jenkins, Reeds Ferry.

NEW MEXICO

Pearl Komfala, Camerco.
Meliton Struck, Ranches of Taos.

OKLAHOMA

William Trigg Music, Elk City.

OREGON

Donald R. Muth, Empire.
Harold M. Laws, Rogue River.

TEXAS

Andrew J. LeRibeus, Angleton.
Collier M. Yeury, Howe.
Louella Elam, Milano.
Willie E. Warren, Paint Rock.
Donald E. Williams, Seagraves.
Ward O. Barker, Sulphur Bluff.

VERMONT

Edward J. Duzinski, Essex Junction.
Alice C. FitzSimonds, Underhill.

VIRGINIA

Jesse N. Cahoon, Clifton Forge.

WASHINGTON

Clare F. Lee, Colville.
George A. Bremner, Jr., Lynden.

WEST VIRGINIA

Hugh A. Christie, Everettville.
Lindsey C. Foster, Pennsboro.
Ethel N. Tuggle, Peterstown.
Jack R. Michael, Prichard.
Fred A. Williams, Princeton.
Grace Watkins, Seth.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 7, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, we pray that Thou wilt expand our hearts with gratitude, for in Thy benevolent goodness we find an abundant supply for our many needs, strength for every task, wisdom for the solution of every problem, and consolation for every sorrow.

We thank Thee for the glorious assurance that we are all the children of Thy love and the subjects of Thy kingdom. Grant unto the members of the human family the grace to live together in the bonds of amity and brotherhood, seeking for one another those blessings which none can ever find or enjoy alone.

Enlarge our minds with a more eager spirit to help those for whom the struggle of life is so difficult. May we have the vision to see their point of view with sympathy and understanding, lest we become haughty in our judgments and hardened with self-interest and personal aggrandizement.

We pray for our President, our Speaker, and all of the chosen Representatives of our beloved country. Grant that they may be the honored servants of the Lord to hasten that glorious day of prediction when there shall be peace upon this earth. We thank Thee for

this day of gladness. May it be a day of penitence and of praise, of commemoration and of consecration when we shall dedicate ourselves to the fulfillment of that time when man everywhere shall be brought into a glad and willing obedience to the Prince of Peace.

Hear us in the name of Christ our friend and elder brother. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 4, 1945, was read and approved.

RECESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order during the remainder of the day for the Speaker to declare such recess as he may desire, the reconvening of the House to be subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do this for the purpose of making an inquiry as to the object of this request and ask for any detail that the gentleman might like to give us.

Mr. McCORMACK. In the event the hoped-for proclamation from an official angle of VE-day has arrived, I thought it might be that the Speaker would desire to have the House stand in recess. There are many rumors. The leadership, as far as I am able to ascertain, has nothing definite, although it is hoped that the official announcement may be made possibly some time during the afternoon, in which event the Speaker may desire to have the House stand in recess.

The SPEAKER. Permit the Chair to make this statement: The Chair has been in communication with the White House this morning. The Chair knows nothing more than any other Member of the House. But in case the President of the United States issues a proclamation this afternoon it will be on the air and the Chair has arranged that the Members may remain in their seats to hear this proclamation. The Chair thinks it would be wise, therefore, for the House to be in recess for this reason.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is it the understanding that after the proclamation comes, if it does come, we are going to continue to work for the rest of the day?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is our intention. I hope the House will concur in the thought that we go ahead with the work of the day as an example for the rest of the country. The House should continue to carry on its regular work even if the official announcement is made.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I agree with the gentleman that we should set a good example here.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I wonder if it is the intention of the gentleman from Massachusetts to have the bells rung so that the Members will know when to be here.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think it is the understanding that the usual 15-minute notice will be given.

The SPEAKER. Of course, the Chair will give the 15-minute notice of the reassembling, but the Chair might not receive notice until 5 or 10 minutes before the President goes on the air, if he does go on today.

Mr. McCORMACK. Under those circumstances, I am sure the gentleman from Mississippi and the other Members of the House realize that it is best to leave that to the discretion of the Speaker.

Mr. RANKIN. But the bells will be rung?

Mr. McCORMACK. No matter what notice is given, that is something that could very easily be done, and I assume will be done.

The SPEAKER. The bells will be rung. They will ring five times for the recess. That should be notice to the Members that we are standing in recess for a specific purpose.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I do so only to ask the majority leader and possibly the Chair if they feel it would be proper and fitting under the circumstances for Members to withhold any remarks they might feel they wanted to make on this occasion until after the President's proclamation has been made?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, that is a matter of discretion for each individual member, and I would not want to undertake to express an opinion on that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

WAR DEPARTMENT REDEPLOYMENT PLAN

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, in view of certain statements appearing in the press referring to the Committee on Military Affairs, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for not to exceed 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has talked to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] and thinks that under the circumstances, due to an injustice to the gentleman, the Chair is justified in breaking the 1-minute rule and entertaining the request that he may proceed for 10 minutes.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, within the last few days there has been certain publicity in the press referring to members of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives which I regard as most unfortunate. My own opinion is that none of the information revealed was of a serious nature or even unknown, but it is unfortunate that in the time element of that publicity it came when it did, and not until the official War Department statement on redeployment had been made.

On Friday morning, like a number of other Members of Congress, I made a radio record in the sound studios here for transmission to New York State stu-